

The SECRETARY. On page 80, line 22, after the word "dollars," it is proposed to insert "deputy marshal, \$1,000."

The amendment was rejected.

Mr. GALLINGER. Now, I move that the words "who is hereby authorized to act as clerk in the absence of that officer," be inserted after the words "deputy clerk, \$1,200," which were inserted on my motion.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The amendment will be stated.

The SECRETARY. On page 80, line 18, after the amendment inserting the words "deputy clerk, \$1,200," it is proposed to insert "who is hereby authorized to act as clerk in the absence of that officer."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The amendment was agreed to.

Mr. GALLINGER. The total should be changed on lines 23 and 24, page 80, so as to read "\$10,440."

The VICE-PRESIDENT. That change will be made in the absence of objection.

Mr. GALLINGER. Mr. President, we have been in session a good while, and, if it be agreeable to other Senators, I suggest that we discontinue the further consideration of the bill for the day. I move that the Senate adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 5 o'clock and 15 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until to-morrow, Friday, February 5, 1909, at 12 o'clock meridian.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

THURSDAY, February 4, 1909.

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

VALDEZ, MARSHALL PASS AND NORTHERN RAILROAD.

Mr. REYNOLDS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25823) to amend an act entitled "An act to extend the time for the completion of the Valdez, Marshall Pass and Northern Railroad, and for other purposes," approved February 21, 1907.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from further consideration of the following bill and to consider the same in the House. The Clerk will report the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. BONYNGE. Mr. Speaker, for the present I shall have to object.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado objects.

ALASKA PACIFIC RAILWAY AND TERMINAL COMPANY.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 25553) for the relief of the Alaska Pacific Railway and Terminal Company.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the following bill, and to consider the same in the House.

The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Mr. Speaker, I shall have to reserve the right to object—

Mr. BONYNGE. I desire to object to that bill also, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Colorado objects.

BRIDGE ACROSS CONDADO BAY, SAN JUAN, P. R.

Mr. LARRINAGA. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce be discharged from the further consideration of the bill (H. R. 26838) to authorize Behn Brothers, of San Juan, P. R., to construct a bridge across a portion of the Condado Bay, at the eastern extremity of San Juan Island, Porto Rico, and that the same be referred to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

The SPEAKER. The Commissioner from Porto Rico asks unanimous consent for a change of reference of the following bill, of which the Clerk will report the title, from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, what is the request?

The SPEAKER. He asks unanimous consent to change the reference of this bill from the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce to the Committee on Insular Affairs. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 16015. An act for the relief of Lafayette L. McKnight;

H. R. 20171. An act to correct the military record of George H. Tracy;

H. R. 10752. An act to complete the military record of Adolphus Erwin Wells;

H. R. 2952. An act for the relief of Chaplain Henry Swift, Thirteenth Infantry, U. S. Army; and

H. R. 11460. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Houck.

BRIDGES ACROSS ROCK RIVER, ILLINOIS.

Mr. PRINCE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the bill (H. R. 26482) to authorize the construction of two bridges across Rock River, State of Illinois.

The Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Rock River Traction Company, a corporation organized under the laws of the State of Illinois, its successors and assigns, be, and they are hereby, authorized to construct two bridges across Rock River; the first bridge at a point between the west line of section 30 and the west line of section 14 in township 20 north, range 5 east, in the State of Illinois; the second bridge at a point between the east line of section 30 and the west line of section 23 in township 21 north, range 7 east, in the State of Illinois. Said bridges to be built across Rock River, in accordance with the provisions of an act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

Sec. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

ADVANCE IN FREIGHT RATES.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD the report of the Interstate Commerce Commission in reply to a resolution asking for information as to the advance of freight rates throughout the country. I understand the report is on the Speaker's desk.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent for printing in the RECORD the report from the Interstate Commerce Commission in relation to an inquiry for information as to the advanced freight rates throughout the United States. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Does the gentleman desire this to dispose of the matter, or will he ask to have it sent to a committee?

Mr. MADDEN. I understand it will be printed as a public document. I want it printed in the RECORD for the information of the House.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to its being printed in the RECORD, and that was the reason of my inquiry whether, after being printed in the RECORD, it would be referred to the committee—naturally to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, I assume.

The SPEAKER. It would be referred and printed as a public document (H. Doc. No. 1412), and the gentleman's request is that it be printed in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The report is as follows:

INTERSTATE COMMERCE COMMISSION, Washington, February 4, 1909.

To the House of Representatives:

On January 15 the House of Representatives adopted the following resolution:

"Resolved, That the Interstate Commerce Commission be required to inform the House, as soon as may be, what advances have occurred in freight rates in different parts of the United States since the passage of the Hepburn amendment, June 29, 1906; whether such advances have been occasioned by an advance in the tariff rate or by a change in classification or by charging for some privilege which was formerly accorded free."

In response thereto the Interstate Commerce Commission has the honor to report:

Between July 1, 1906, and January 15, 1909, nearly 600,000 schedules of rates and classifications and supplements thereto, varying in size from 1 page to 700 pages, were filed with this commission. No record has been kept of the number of pages contained in schedules as they were filed. Such record has now been kept for one week, and it is found that the schedules and supplements average 5 pages each. This is believed to be a fair average for the period above mentioned, and, based thereon, it is seen that the schedules filed within that period contained approximately 3,000,000 pages. The number of rate items is conservatively estimated to be about 50 per page, and in order to determine accurately what advances have been effected by such schedules

it would be necessary to examine and compare 150,000,000 rate items, with a like number of items filed previous to July 1, 1906.

This estimate does not take into account changes which have been effected in the absence of through joint rates by changes in proportional rates, basing rates, or local rates which are used in the absence of joint through rates for making through rates in combination with other similar rates. For example, a single-page schedule naming proportional rates from New York and other Atlantic seaboard cities to Chicago, Peoria, East St. Louis, and other Mississippi River crossings and applicable to traffic destined to points west of the Mississippi River, if changed, would affect through rates to thousands of destinations west of the Mississippi River. In instances of this kind—and they are numerous—the present rates would have to be determined by combining the proportional rates east of the base points with the local rates west thereof, and before comparison could be made, former rates would have to be made up in like manner.

A schedule of 90 pages recently filed contains specific rates on 3,800 separate articles. There are two ratings, one applicable to carload quantities and one to less than carload quantities, for most of these articles. The rates apply from ten groups of origin, embracing a large number of the States east of the Mississippi River. This schedule contains approximately 60,000 separate specific rates, and in order to determine what changes are effected thereby comparison would have to be made with a like number of items published in previous schedules. This schedule was not of exceptional size, as many schedules contain between 200 and 700 pages.

On a previous occasion the schedules filed upon a single day were examined and compared with corresponding rates previously on file. Eight rate clerks were engaged upon this work for a period of seven days and were unable within that time to complete the check of the single day's filing. The number of schedules filed on that day was considerably below the average daily filing. The number of pages so examined did not exceed 2,000, while the present average number of pages filed per day is about 3,800.

It will therefore be seen that it is impossible, with the present force, to undertake such check of rates as would be necessary in order to secure in complete form the information requested, and that even if a very large number of additional clerks were employed for that purpose it would probably be a work of several years. Experienced rate clerks would be essential to intelligent work in that line, and even if they were available, which they are not, so many changes would be effected in rates during the time within which statement was being prepared that it would not accurately represent conditions at the time of its completion.

Many important advances in rates have been made since the passage of the Hepburn amendment. We have not been able to keep a record of the advances, but, in a general way, the following are noted:

The different freight association territories hereinafter referred to are, in a general way, defined as follows:

Central Freight Association territory is that territory lying west of Buffalo and Pittsburg, north of the Ohio River, and east of Chicago and St. Louis.

Southeastern Freight Association territory is that territory lying south of the Ohio and east of the Mississippi rivers.

Trunk Line territory is that territory lying north of the Ohio River, east of Buffalo and Pittsburg, and west of the Hudson River.

Transcontinental rates apply between points on the Pacific coast and points east of the Missouri and Mississippi rivers. Under these rates it is common to blanket a large territory on the east. For example, many of these rates apply alike from or to all points east of Chicago and north of the Ohio River.

Official classification territory includes all the territory east of Chicago and St. Louis and north of the Ohio River.

Southern classification territory includes the territory south and east of the Ohio and Mississippi rivers.

Western classification territory includes all the territory west of the official and southern classification territories.

COAL.

Rates have been advanced 5 cents per ton from the Pennsylvania, Maryland, and West Virginia fields to Central Freight Association territory and from the Kentucky, Tennessee, and Alabama fields to points in Southeastern Freight Association territory.

PIG IRON.

Rates have been advanced 25 cents per ton from furnace points in Southeastern Freight Association territory to points in Central Freight Association and trunk-line territories.

CAST-IRON PIPE.

Rates have been advanced 25 cents per ton from foundry points in Southeastern Freight Association territory to points in Central Freight Association and trunk-line territories.

IRON AND STEEL ARTICLES.

Rates subject to official classification have been generally advanced by the withdrawal of commodity rates and the application in lieu thereof of higher class rates. These advances are not uniform to all points affected.

LUMBER.

Rates from Chicago and points basing thereon to trunk-line territory have been generally advanced by withdrawal of commodity rates and the application in lieu thereof of higher class rates. This advance was not uniform as to all points affected.

Rates from producing points in the Pacific Northwest to all destinations were advanced on November 1, 1907. After full hearing on complaint, this commission condemned the advance made from the producing points to points lying west of a line drawn from Pembina, N. Dak., through Omaha and Kansas City to Port Arthur, Tex. An increase of 5 cents per 100 pounds was permitted to points lying east of that line.

GRAIN AND GRAIN PRODUCTS.

Rates have been advanced 2 cents per 100 pounds from Ohio and Mississippi River crossings to Southeastern Freight Association territory. Rates from northern and western producing points are based upon the Ohio and Mississippi River crossing rates, and therefore this advance resulted in an advance from all that territory.

Rates were advanced 2 cents per 100 pounds from Chicago to New York in May, 1907. The proportional rate applicable from Chicago on shipments from points west of the Mississippi River was reduced 1½ cents per 100 pounds on wheat and corn, and one-half cent per 100 pounds on rye, oats, and barley in May, 1908.

Rates from the Missouri River to the Mississippi River crossings and to Chicago were increased 1½ cents per 100 pounds in July, 1907.

PACKING-HOUSE PRODUCTS.

Rates have been advanced 3 cents per 100 pounds from Ohio and Mississippi River crossings to Southeastern Freight Association territory. Rates from northern and western producing points are based upon the Ohio and Mississippi River rates, and therefore corresponding advances result in rates from those producing points.

SUGAR.

Rates have been advanced 2 cents per 100 pounds from New York and New Orleans and from points in trunk-line territory, rates from which are made with relation to the New York rates, to points in Central Freight Association territory and to Chicago and to St. Paul and to points in the Northwest, the rates to which are made with relation to the Chicago or St. Paul rates.

TO TEXAS POINTS.

Rates have been advanced from Kansas City and St. Louis and points basing thereon, which embraces the entire territory east of the Mississippi River and a large number of points west thereof, to Texas points in sums ranging from 4 cents per 100 pounds on one class or article to 10 cents per 100 pounds on another class or article.

TRANSCONTINENTAL RATES.

These rates have been advanced both eastbound and westbound between points in the Atlantic seaboard territory and States east of the Mississippi River on the one hand, and terminal points on the Pacific coast and intermediate points, the rates to which are made with relation thereto on the other hand, in sums ranging from 3 per cent on one article to 60 per cent on another article. The heaviest advance was in eastbound rates.

CLASSIFICATIONS.

Many advances in rates have been effected by changes in classification ratings and without changes in the specific scale of rates. Many changes in required carload minimum weights have been made. These do not necessarily increase the rates upon the commodities to which they apply unless the minimum weight has been fixed so high as to make it impossible to load it into the car.

OTHER CHANGES.

The tariffs of to-day contain many listed charges for services which would not be found in the tariffs in effect immediately prior to the Hepburn amendment. They, however, can not be said to be additional or increased charges, because now the tariffs contain lawful authority and provision for many services and charges which formerly were rendered without specific tariff authority therefor. The tariffs now contain many provisions for assessment and absorption of switching charges, which simply continue former practices for which provision was not made in the tariffs. The same is no doubt true as to many transit privileges.

EXPRESS RATES.

Express companies were first brought under the act to regulate commerce by the Hepburn amendment, and this necessitated an entire reconstruction of their rate schedules. None were on file with the commission prior to that time. No general advances in the charges of express companies have been noted except between various points in New England territory, where advances have been made ranging from 10 cents to 25 cents per 100 pounds.

PASSENGER FARES.

There have been no general increases in passenger fares; the tendency has been in the opposite direction. Reductions in state fares have resulted in a general lowering of interstate passenger rates.

The general increases in rates to Southeastern Freight Association territory and the increase in the rates to southwestern territory have been made the subject of complaint to this commission, and these complaints are in course of investigation, several hearings on same having been had.

As stated in our annual report recently submitted to the Congress, the commission, on April 15, 1908, promulgated a ruling that tariffs applying on traffic exported to or imported from foreign countries not adjacent to the United States must, in accordance with the requirements of the law, show the rates, fares, and charges of the inland carriers, subject to the act for the transportation in the United States to the port and from the port.

Rather than to conform to this requirement, the rail carriers in the United States ordinarily known as "the transcontinental lines," withdrew, effective November 1, 1908, all their through import and export rates via the Pacific ports, leaving their domestic rates to and from the ports to apply to the inland carriage of such export and import traffic.

Presumably this resulted in increased rates upon such traffic as has been subsequently imported or exported through those ports, but we have no means of measuring the advance, as the tariffs did not disclose, and we were not informed how the former rates were divided between the rail carriers in this country and the ocean steamship lines, and we have no means of knowing now what are the charges of the steamship lines.

Very respectfully,

MARTIN A. KNAPP, *Chairman.*

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the agricultural appropriation bill (H. R. 27053).

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, with Mr. FOSTER of Vermont in the chair.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent of offices and repairs to buildings now completed and located outside of the District of Columbia and care and preservation of grounds, including construction of sidewalks and curbing on public streets abutting Weather Bureau grounds, \$80,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve a point of order. I notice this item carried in the appropriation—for the construction of sidewalks and curbing on public streets abutting the Weather Bureau grounds.

It has not been the custom of the General Government to pay for curbing in front of public grounds, as I have found to my bitter regret on various occasions, and I would like to inquire of the gentleman what this is for. I may personally have no objection to it.

Mr. SCOTT. We asked the Chief of the Weather Bureau why he included the language in the estimate, and he stated, as I recall it, that the sidewalks and curbing around the Weather Bureau building in Washington are getting out of repair.

Mr. MANN. Is this for the city of Washington?

Mr. SCOTT. For the city of Washington.

Mr. MANN. The item covers buildings outside. Is this construction of sidewalk and curbing on public streets only for the Weather Bureau grounds in Washington?

Mr. SCOTT. It is only for Washington, according to my recollection.

Mr. MANN. No; it says:

Buildings now completed and located outside of the District of Columbia, and care and preservation of grounds.

Mr. SCOTT. The impression I gained from the statement made before the committee by the chief of the bureau was that he had no expectation of using any of the money outside of the city of Washington for this purpose.

Mr. MANN. I do not see how he could use it inside the District of Columbia. It says:

For rent of offices and repairs to buildings now completed and located outside of the District of Columbia, and care and preservation of grounds, including construction of sidewalks and curbing on public streets abutting Weather Bureau grounds.

I think that would only apply to buildings outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. SCOTT. The language undoubtedly bears that construction. I was quoting my recollection of what the Chief of the Weather Bureau said he wanted the money for.

Mr. MANN. Very likely that is what he desired it for.

Mr. SCOTT. But even if it was wanted for Weather Bureau stations outside of the District of Columbia, I do not see why it ought not to be given. The custom in all the cities I know of is for property owners to keep the sidewalks in repair.

Mr. MANN. I think they ought to build the sidewalks.

Mr. SCOTT. In the city where I live we have to keep the curbing in repair. I do not know whether that is the custom in other places or not.

Mr. MANN. The curbing is usually a part of the pavement.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want to call the attention of the gentleman to the fact that the word "bureau" in this paragraph is singular.

Mr. MANN. The words "Weather Bureau grounds" would include grounds anywhere in the United States.

Mr. SCOTT. In looking over the language I think it would apply to bureau grounds not in the city. I think the plural goes to the word "grounds."

Mr. MANN. Would the gentleman consent to strike out the word "curbing?" In other words, I do not undertake to say what the policy of the Government should be, but it ought to be the same policy in regard to the Weather Bureau as to other public buildings.

Mr. SCOTT. I would consent to an amendment striking out the words "and curbing," if the gentleman desires to offer it.

Mr. MANN. Then, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I desire to reserve the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] withdraws the point of order and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN] renews it.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I do so for the purpose of getting the gentleman in charge of the bill to agree to an amendment striking out any language of this appropriation that may apply to the District of Columbia.

Mr. MANN. It does not apply to the District of Columbia.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not believe, on reconsideration, that any of it would apply to the District.

Mr. MANN. It expressly provides for outside of the District of Columbia.

Mr. MADDEN. That is all right.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I ask for a vote on the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The point of order is withdrawn and I offer an amendment to strike out in line 22, the words "and curbing."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 22, strike out the words "and curbing."

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

For official traveling expenses, \$22,000.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. Will the gentleman inform us how this money for traveling expenses is expended and if there is any limitation upon the per diem traveling expenses?

Mr. SCOTT. There is no limitation except the money shall be paid upon sworn vouchers, which are handed in by the agents of the bureau who do the traveling.

Mr. MANN. It is only the actual expenses?

Mr. SCOTT. It is only the actual expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. Unless objection is heard, the pro forma amendment will be considered as withdrawn.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Who audits the accounts?

Mr. SCOTT. They are audited first by the accountant of the Weather Bureau, and from him they go to the accountant in the department, and from him they go to the Auditor for the State and other Departments.

Mr. MADDEN. Actual expenses mean what?

Mr. SCOTT. It means actual expenses.

Mr. MADDEN. Is there any limit placed on the person expending the money as to what the actual expenses are to be?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not think there is any limit in the law, but I wish to assure the gentleman from Illinois that in my judgment there is no department of the Government where a closer accounting is kept than in this department and where those who travel at the expense of the Government are more carefully required to keep their expenses within reasonable limits.

Mr. MADDEN. Does not the gentleman think there ought to be a limit placed as a maximum?

Mr. SCOTT. Is there a limit placed in any other department, does the gentleman know?

Mr. MADDEN. Oh, yes; I think there is—

Mr. MANN. This does not cover per diem at all.

Mr. SCOTT. There is no per diem in this. The man who travels is obliged to keep an account, just as a commercial man keeps an account with his house, and to swear to it when he hands in his account at the end of the month.

Mr. MADDEN. Most of the business houses when they send a man out on the road limit the amount he can expend in any one day.

Mr. SCOTT. I think it is very clearly understood in a general way among the employees of the department how much they shall expend, and I do not believe they offend against economy in that particular.

Mr. MADDEN. Would it not be a good plan to limit them as to how far they could go?

Mr. SCOTT. I doubt whether that would be advisable, for the reason that some of the employees of the bureau may require a greater allowance for traveling expenses than others.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. HEPBURN. I desire to know what is now before the committee.

The CHAIRMAN. A motion to strike out the last word.

Mr. HEPBURN. I noticed a triangular contest between those gentlemen over there in whispers, and I thought perhaps the committee ought to be in secret session.

The CHAIRMAN. The committee will be in order, and gentlemen desiring to converse will retire to the cloakrooms.

Mr. MADDEN. Then it is understood in this bureau there are several degrees of expenses that may be incurred—that a man who has a higher classification in the service could incur higher expenses. Is that it?

Mr. SCOTT. For example, the chief of a bureau in traveling throughout the country would be expected to stop at higher-class hotels than some minor employee who might have occasion to go from one part of the country to the other.

Mr. MADDEN. Then what might be considered reasonable expenses for one person might be considered extravagant in the other, according to the view of the gentleman in charge of this bill.

Mr. SCOTT. That is the view I take of it.

Mr. MADDEN. It seems to me that any person who might be sent as a messenger for the Government in connection with the work of this department would be considered equally qualified to perform the duties of any other man who might be sent on a similar message; and that being the case they each would have similar rights of expenditure, and there ought not to be a minimum for the one and a maximum for the other.

Mr. SCOTT. Well, I have examined the accounting system in this department with a great deal of care. I have gone over a good many of these expense vouchers, and have investigated the matter closely. I have not yet seen any occasion for adopting either a maximum or minimum limit of expenditure.

Mr. MADDEN. The gentleman having taken the pains to make a personal investigation into the accounting of the items which would naturally be vouchered under this appropriation, will he be good enough to say to the committee what the average expenditure per person is each day while traveling in his official capacity?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, they usually figure that from \$3 to \$5 a day, probably nearer \$5 than \$3, is the average traveling expense—not only in this bureau but in other bureaus of the department.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia and Mr. GAINES of West Virginia rose.

The CHAIRMAN. To whom does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. Scott] yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Edwards].

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman's time has expired.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. Will the gentleman in charge of the bill consent to this amendment, namely, to insert on line 24, after the word "for," the words "actual and necessary," so that the sentence will read—

For actual and necessary official traveling expenses, \$22,000.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I prefer not to accept that amendment, for the reason that throughout this bill we have used the term "official traveling expenses." That is the term which has been construed by the accounting officers of the Government to mean exactly what the gentleman says, namely, actual and necessary official traveling expenses. The words which he offers to insert as an amendment are not necessary under the construction that has been placed on the present language by the accounting officers.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I respectfully submit that there could be official traveling expenses without being actual and necessary, and I think the amendment ought to be made, and I offer it.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Edwards] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Line 24, on page 6, before the word "official," insert "actual and necessary."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I hope that amendment will not prevail. The committee has made an honest effort to word this bill in the simplest possible language so that it may be clear and easily understood. We considered carefully the matter of the phraseology which should be used in covering the subject of traveling expenses, and were told by the accounting officer of the bureau, who is one of the most careful and efficient men in that capacity in the Government employ, I think, that the phrase "official traveling expenses" had been construed by the auditing officers of the Treasury Department as meaning only actual and necessary expenses. This being true, the amendment offered by the gentleman simply cumbers the bill with unnecessary phraseology, and I hope it will be voted down.

Mr. STAFFORD. If the phrase as now carried in the bill is construed in the language of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. Edwards], what objection can there be to inserting it? I wish to say, in addition, that the language as suggested in the amendment is the same phraseology as that carried in other appropriation bills.

Mr. SCOTT. The objection to inserting it is, first, that it is unnecessary; second, that we ought to keep the language of the bill harmonious and not be compelled to insert the words everywhere else where the term "official expenses" is used; and, third, that it adds words without adding meaning. I ask for a vote on the amendment.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. May I ask the gentleman a question bearing on this part of the bill? Do the words "official traveling expenses" include subsistence while traveling? I take it, from what has been said, that they do.

Mr. SCOTT. They do.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. I remember when I was connected at one time with the Department of Justice that the allowance for subsistence when traveling was limited. I do not know whether it is the law now in the Department of Justice or not, but some years ago the subsistence expenses were limited to \$4 a day. What is the reason that the limitation upon the traveling expenses has been taken out of the language of the agricultural appropriation bill when appropriating for travel?

Mr. LIVINGSTON. The Committee on Appropriations always put a limit on the expenses for travel in the bills they report from that committee.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. The gentleman from Georgia states that the Committee on Appropriations always puts in a

limit on the traveling expenses on the appropriation bills that come from that committee. I ask the gentleman in charge of this bill why such language is not included in the language of the agricultural appropriation bill?

Mr. SCOTT. Such a limitation never was included in the language of the agricultural appropriation bill; and I presume it was omitted because it was thought that the expense account was sufficiently guarded when the men paying it out were required to present itemized sworn vouchers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Would not the effect of putting a limitation, as is sometimes provided in other appropriation bills, result in the accounts for subsistence inclining toward the maximum rate rather than the actual amount?

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. I can not see that it would so result. On a sworn statement of actual expenses all people do not put in the maximum amount. All gentlemen are supposed to be honest, and they would not put in the maximum.

Mr. STAFFORD. In many instances it has been shown that where a limit has been placed, many department officials consider that is what they are entitled to, and they enter their expenses at the maximum amount.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. But that is a distinctly wrong impression. It is not considered that the maximum amount is allowed.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to call the attention of the gentleman from West Virginia to a comparatively recent impeachment trial in the Senate of the United States, where a certain federal judge was impeached; and, among other things, the charge was made that he had put in an expense account at the maximum amount, whereas his actual expenses were less than that amount. His defense was that the limitation in the appropriation bill fixed the amount for subsistence at such a figure, and he deemed that he was warranted in charging that amount whether his actual expenses were that much or not.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. But, Mr. Chairman, in the case of Judge Swayne, there were two considerations, which will be remembered. In the first place, his practice was deemed a very bad one; and in the second place, there was a considerable amount of difference of opinion as to whether the appropriation relating to the subsistence of federal judges was not intended by the Appropriations Committee and by Congress that they were to be allowed to charge that amount for their expenses.

I insist again that it is not the practice to charge the maximum amount for subsistence if the actual amount be less than that; and where any officer does put in a sworn account to the maximum amount when the actual expense was less than that he is liable to prosecution.

Mr. SCOTT. My judgment is, Mr. Chairman, that it would not be in the interest of economy to adopt this amendment, and I trust, therefore, that it will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend, in line 24, by inserting "for actual official traveling expenses and subsistence not exceeding the sum of \$4 per day."

Mr. MANN. They could not travel far on that.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. That does not cover the traveling.

Mr. SCOTT. I would like to have the amendment read from the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 6, line 24, before the word "official," insert "actual," and amend so it will read "actual official traveling expenses and subsistence, not exceeding the sum of \$4 per day."

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to reserve the point of order against the amendment; in the first place, because I believe it is legislation; and I reserve that point and speak to the merits of the amendment.

I wish to say that in my judgment this amendment would make it impossible for the Chief of the Weather Bureau to travel at all and have his expenses paid. The chief of a great government bureau as conspicuous as the Weather Bureau ought when he travels to travel as any Member of this House would travel. He ought to stop at good hotels, and in other ways maintain the position of dignity which should be held by any gentleman representing this Government in a high official capacity. That can not be done, as I think we can all testify, on \$4 a day. I do not believe, either, that the adoption of this amendment would tend to economy, because, in spite of what the gentleman from West Virginia says, it is my information that it is the universal practice, when such a limitation is placed upon traveling expenses, to construe the amount named as a minimum. I am assured that in a great deal of the trav-

eling done by the minor officials of the Weather Bureau the expenses amount to less than \$4 a day.

It seems to me, therefore, that this amendment would result in increasing rather than in diminishing this traveling-expense account, and I trust therefore, if it be held in order, that it will be voted down.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. HULL of Iowa. Is this \$4 limitation intended to apply to transportation as well as subsistence?

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman from West Virginia must answer that question.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. No; the language is not open to that interpretation. The limitation is plainly upon subsistence, and not traveling expenses, of course. It is actual traveling expenses, and subsistence not exceeding \$4 a day. I should be willing to increase the amount to \$6 a day, if the gentleman thinks so, but there ought to be a limitation.

Mr. SCOTT. I would ask for a ruling on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. OLMSTED). The gentleman will state his point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. That the proposition to amend this bill by fixing a maximum of subsistence is legislation, and therefore contrary to the rule.

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. The remarks of the gentleman from Kansas show that this would result in a reduction of expenditure, and the language itself shows it to be a limitation, and therefore it is not obnoxious to the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair would ask the gentleman from Kansas whether there is any authority of law for the payment of the traveling expenses provided in the bill?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, undoubtedly there is the general authority of law to cover that point, but I do not believe there is any authority to fix a certain amount as subsistence in addition to traveling expenses.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from West Virginia whether the limitation in the amendment, the words "not exceeding the sum of \$4 per day," is intended to apply only to subsistence or to qualify also the word "expenses?"

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. Clearly, it does not, Mr. Chairman. It is intimated by gentlemen around me that I do not understand the Chairman's question, and I admit I did not hear it very well. There is a great deal of conversation going on around me.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from West Virginia whether this limitation of \$4 a day is intended to apply to the two items?

Mr. GAINES of West Virginia. It does not. It applies only to subsistence, and not, of course, to the traveling expenses. That would appear very clearly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of opinion that unless there is some authority shown for the appropriation for subsistence the amendment in the present form is open to the point of order. If it were merely a limitation upon the appropriation for traveling expenses to a certain amount, the Chair would think it a limitation within the rule, as frequently construed; but it seems to separate the two items, and applies the limitation only to the matter of subsistence, for which latter item no authority of law has been shown. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For telephone rentals and for telegraphing, telephoning, and cabling reports and messages, rates to be fixed by the Secretary of Agriculture by agreements with the companies performing the service, \$260,000.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what rates are fixed for telephoning and telegraphing as between the Secretary and the company?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not recall at this moment what the rates are. That question did not come up in the hearings this year, because we had discussed it in previous years and had obtained the information. Just at this moment I can not recall.

Mr. MORSE. Are any reductions made to the Government?

Mr. SCOTT. Oh, the reductions are very great indeed. And I will say further, that the cost of telegraphing to this bureau is very much reduced by a code which is used, by means of which a message which ordinarily would require 20 or 30 words can be transmitted by the use of 3 or 4 words.

Mr. MORSE. Is there any law of the United States which prevents the Government securing special privileges from the telephone and telegraph companies?

Mr. SCOTT. I do not know of any, and I think there can be none, because undoubtedly the Government does get better rates

from the telegraph and telephone companies than any individual or organization that I know of is able to get.

Mr. MORSE. Is this sent out for a less sum than the Government rates, a cent a word?

Mr. SCOTT. I think it is for considerably less than the usual Government rates and less than the press rates.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words. I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas what the objection is in leaving the fixing of the rates to the chief of the bureau instead of to the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. SCOTT. The Secretary of Agriculture has supervision over the bureau. It is simply a branch of his department, and there does not seem to be any reason why that authority should not be invested in him.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Yes; he has supervision, but the chief of the bureau has direct charge of it and is closely in touch with it.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman will find, if he follows the bill through, that the Secretary of Agriculture is always named when some important executive act is to be performed.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance and repair of Weather Bureau telegraph, telephone, and cable lines, \$4,200.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to ask the gentleman from Kansas whether the Government owns any telegraph, telephone, or cable lines outside of the city of Washington?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; the Government owns such lines at several points, chiefly along the edge of the continent, if I might use that expression. For instance, we have weather bureau stations on islands adjacent to the coast, and we have some in the Great Lakes, and cables have been laid from the mainland to those islands.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And there are no other means of communication except by these special telegraph and cable lines?

Mr. SCOTT. No.

Mr. DRISCOLL. And this is for the maintenance and repair of those lines?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MANN. I may say to the gentleman that these lines do some outside business, but the receipts are all turned into the Treasury.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Turned into this fund?

Mr. MANN. No; into the Treasury, into the miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the maintenance of a printing office in the city of Washington, including the purchase of necessary supplies and materials for printing weather maps, bulletins, circulars, forms, and other publications, and for pay of additional assistant foremen, proof readers, compositors, pressmen, lithographers, and folders and feeders, when necessary, \$45,000.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the chairman of the committee a question. They have a regular printing office in the Weather Bureau?

Mr. SCOTT. We have a printing office there.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Have you a scale of prices so that we can get at the cost of printing and compare it with the cost of printing in the Public Printing Office?

Mr. SCOTT. I doubt very much whether the work of the Weather Bureau printing office would afford data for such a comparison as the gentleman wishes.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do you have any printing for that bureau done at the Public Printing Office?

Mr. SCOTT. I think the reports of the chief and the bulletins, when a large number are required, are printed in the general printing office. The work that is done in the bureau printing office is chiefly that of the printing of maps, the monthly and weekly Weather Bureau reports, and the necessary blanks used by the bureau.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. And the committee did not look into the cost of that printing?

Mr. SCOTT. No; we did not have any occasion to do that, because we make an appropriation for the maintenance of the office in a lump sum, and it has not changed for many years until this year, when we allowed an increase of \$15,000 because it was the intention of the chief to print in the bureau here at Washington publications which heretofore have been printed in the offices throughout the country. The chief recommended that the publications heretofore printed in the outside offices be dis-

continued, and we believe it is in the interest of economy to have the change made.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Do I understand you to say that there has been an increase in the price of the work?

Mr. SCOTT. No; not in the price of the work, but an increase of \$15,000 in the appropriation.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. If the gentleman listened to the discussion a few days ago on the floor in regard to the Interior Department and the Treasury Department, he will remember that the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations stated that there has been an increase of 55 per cent in the cost of printing. The gentleman has not discovered that in this bureau?

Mr. SCOTT. There is no occasion for any report of that kind coming from the printing office of the Weather Bureau, for the reason that it does not do any work for any other outside bureau, and therefore has no occasion to make any itemized statement showing the cost of its work.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. I want the gentleman to understand that it is just as necessary for the Government to have cheap printing done as it is for an outsider.

Mr. SCOTT. I quite agree with the gentleman.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a point of order, that the gentlemen carrying on the colloquy are out of order. I submit that whatever there is in the way of address on this floor is to the Chairman of this committee, and that a Member has no right to address another Member on the floor, and carry on in this way a private conversation. I have been listening and attempting to hear what the two gentlemen have said, and not a word have I been able to hear.

Mr. LIVINGSTON. That is not our fault.

Mr. HEPBURN. The gentlemen are violating the rules. It is the duty of each gentleman to address the Chair if he desires to ask a question; and if he desires to answer a question, he must do it through the Chair. That is the parliamentary usage, and any other method is a violation of the law.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF ANIMAL INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Animal Industry: One chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,000; 1 editor and compiler, \$2,000; 4 clerks, class 4; 5 clerks, class 3; 15 clerks, class 2; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 14 clerks, class 1; 14 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 5 clerks, at \$900 each; 3 clerks, at \$840 each; 5 clerks, at \$720 each; 1 mechanic, \$1,200; 1 messenger and custodian, \$1,000; 1 carpenter, \$1,100; 3 carpenters, at \$900 each; 1 painter, \$900; 3 messengers, at \$840 each; 4 messengers, at \$720 each; 2 messenger boys, at \$480 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$840; 2 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; 3 skilled laborers, at \$600 each; 1 skilled laborer, \$660; 1 illustrator, \$1,400; 4 laborers, at \$600 each; 1 laborer, \$480; 1 charwoman, \$540; 6 charwomen, at \$480 each; 2 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$114,100.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I wish to ask if any employees from any other part of this bureau have been transferred to the salary list which is set out in this paragraph.

Mr. SCOTT. Yes; there are a number of employees who have heretofore been paid under the lump-fund appropriations that are now carried to this salary statutory roll.

Mr. DRISCOLL. That is the way the gentleman accounts for the large increase in the total for the salary list?

Mr. SCOTT. That explains it. I will say for the information of the gentleman from New York that the only new places on this roll are 3 clerks, at \$1,000 each. There have been transferred from this bureau to the Secretary's roll 1 clerk of class 2; 1 clerk, at \$840; 2 messengers, at \$720; and 1 skilled laborer, at \$720; and all the transfers to the roll except the 3 clerks which I mentioned have come from the lump-fund appropriation.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Were they employed heretofore in the same work, but paid out of a lump sum?

Mr. SCOTT. They are employed now in the bureau, and there is no change in their official duty. The transfer is made in accordance with the practice of the committee, which, it believes, is in the interest of good legislation, to bring under the statutory roll employees who are regularly engaged in the bureau and are to remain there permanently, so far as we can see.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Illinois insist on the point of order?

Mr. MADDEN. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I notice in this paragraph a number of increases of items, such as laborers, painters, carpenters, and so forth, which, I assume, are perfectly proper; and I would like to ask the gentleman whether the occasion for employing

them now and heretofore, which has only been a recent employment, is because of the additional expense of taking care of the new Agricultural building?

Mr. SCOTT. That accounts for a good many of these places. There are 64 rooms in the new Agricultural building which are used by the Bureau of Animal Industry. A good deal of work is necessary to get those rooms properly fitted up, and therefore the chief of the bureau asks for these increases in his force.

Mr. MANN. I can see the reason for that. May I ask the gentleman a further question? I notice that in the bill the gentleman carries items of carpenters under the Bureau of Animal Industry, carpenters under the Bureau of Plant Industry, and carpenters under the bureau of something else, all located in the new building. Has the gentleman's committee considered the question of whether it is desirable to have these carpenters scattered under different bureaus instead of being all under one head?

Mr. SCOTT. In reply to the gentleman's question I wish to say that the committee has considered that very carefully. Under the appropriation carried in the last year's bill, new shops have been constructed on the department grounds, as the gentleman doubtless knows. When the estimates came before us this year, the committee inquired whether it would not be in the interest of economy to have the mechanics now allotted to the various bureaus all gathered together in these shops under one foreman, so that when the Bureau of Animal Industry needs the services of a carpenter, for example, it could notify that foreman and he could detail a man to do that particular work, and so all the way around the other bureaus. The Secretary, to whom this matter was referred, after consultation doubtless with his chiefs, gave it as his opinion that in another year that could be properly done, but at present, when things are more or less in chaos, owing to the fact that the bureaus have not yet settled down into their new quarters, it seemed more desirable to have the present arrangement continue.

Mr. MANN. Then, it is not intended to continue this as a permanent policy?

Mr. SCOTT. Not if the committee can control it.

Mr. MANN. Probably not. May I ask the gentleman one more question? Are these persons now covered into the regular salaried list people who have been appointed in the classified service through the Civil Service Commission, or are they there by being covered into the classified service?

Mr. SCOTT. They were originally appointed in the classified service, and I will say to the gentleman that they can not get a charwoman in the Department of Agriculture except through the civil service. They can not, even, appoint a laborer on the temporary rolls, so they tell me.

Mr. MANN. I understand that, as far as I am concerned, but that is not true in every case. Now, a charwoman is not in the classified service, and there is a very different roll from which they take the charwomen and from which they take the skilled laborer. What I desired to learn was whether these people who now go into the classified service were originally appointed from the same rolls from which appointments to the classified service are made, or whether they are appointed on the roll from which mere laborers are appointed?

Mr. SCOTT. They were appointed from the rolls from which the classified service is appointed, and it is my information that the only appointments which can be made in the Department of Agriculture outside the civil service are for "experts." I think it is claimed that there is a provision of the civil-service rules under which the Secretary can appoint an expert without calling upon the civil service.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Let me ask a question in connection with a remark the gentleman made. Is it not possible to transfer from other departments to the Agricultural Department persons who have been gotten into those departments without the civil-service examination?

Mr. SCOTT. It is governed by the civil-service regulations; there are such regulations.

Mr. MADDEN. I wish to inquire why the committee thought it necessary to increase the number of clerks provided in lines 9, 11, and 14—3 new clerks, at \$1,000 each?

Mr. SCOTT. That increase is a very small part of the increases asked for by the chief of the bureau in the estimates, and the committee believes that the increase of the work of the bureau justifies this addition to his office force.

Mr. MADDEN. Does the committee think there is an increased work in the Department of Agriculture, as a matter of fact?

Mr. SCOTT. There does not seem to be any doubt about that.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman give it as his opinion that the addition of these three clerks, at \$1,000

each, is a prime necessity for the proper conduct of the work of the department?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it was the opinion of your committee that it is a prime necessity; otherwise it would not have been recommended.

Mr. MADDEN. Then I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois withdraws the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

Cooperative experiments in animal feeding and breeding: For experiments in animal feeding and breeding, in cooperation with the state agricultural experiment stations, including the repairs and additions to and erection of buildings absolutely necessary to carry on the experiments, including rent, and the employment of labor in the city of Washington and elsewhere, and all other necessary expenses, \$50,000.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order and I would like to know what authority of law there is other than in the appropriation bills for several years carrying that provision?

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman refers to the paragraph for cooperative experiments in animal feeding and breeding?

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Yes; page 12, lines 12 to 19.

Mr. SCOTT. Aside from the authority of several preceding appropriation acts—

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Which is no authority at all.

Mr. SCOTT (continuing). It seems to me that under the general authority of the law creating the Department of Agriculture the work may well be justified. The first section of that law provides that—

It shall be the duty of such department to acquire and diffuse among the people of the United States useful knowledge on subjects connected with agriculture in the most general and comprehensive sense of that word.

It seems to me that the investigations provided for in this paragraph may well lead to knowledge relating to the breeding and feeding of domestic animals which will be of very great use to the agricultural interests of the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Now, with the construction which the gentleman puts on the act creating this department, is there anything you can not do in this bill except increase salaries which are fixed by law?

Mr. SCOTT. Well, in my judgment, there are very few things which relate to the fundamental industry of our country which you could not do under the authority of this act.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I confess that the construction of the rule put upon it by the gentleman from Kansas would permit the House to embrace anything in this appropriation bill. As he seems to think that this is a very useful appropriation and of great service to the agricultural interests, I will not make the point of order, although I do not want to be understood as concurring in the proposition that there is no limit on the Committee on Agriculture or on the House when considering this bill as to what new law they shall enact in it. While I think many of the purposes of this and other provisions in this bill are very laudable, I think we have already stretched the authority of Congress to the point of breaking.

Mr. SCOTT. I thoroughly appreciate the gentleman's position.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I will not make the point of order. [Applause.] The purpose of reserving the point of order was to ascertain if this appropriation is made for the purpose of increasing the quality and character of the live stock.

Mr. SCOTT. That is the purpose of this investigation.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. BARTLETT] has expired.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I am very much in favor of that, and I will not make the point of order. [Applause.]

Mr. COX of Indiana. Can the gentleman inform the committee how much money the Government spends annually in cooperative work in the various institutions of the States?

Mr. SCOTT. I have never had a statement prepared showing all of the money that is expended in cooperation with the various States, and I am unable to give the gentleman a categorical answer.

Mr. COX of Indiana. I think it is a splendid work that the Government is doing. If the gentleman could approximate the amount, I would like to know.

Mr. SCOTT. I wish to say that it is the disposition of the committee, wherever it can be justly done, to require the States to cooperate in the event that the General Government spends any money within their borders for a specific purpose.

Mr. COX of Indiana. Can the gentleman answer this question, How many States are now cooperating with the General Government along this line?

Mr. SCOTT. There is hardly a State in the Union that is not cooperating in some way with the General Government.

Mr. COX of Indiana. They have practically all taken advantage of it?

Mr. SCOTT. Nearly all of them have done so; and I may add that the cooperation of the States in the matter of the enforcement of the pure-food law is referred to especially by the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry as being helpful and in the interest of economy.

The Clerk read as follows:

Total for Bureau of Animal Industry, \$1,402,860.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I wish to ask the chairman of this committee whether it is expected that this bureau will take on any new and additional lines or kinds of work other than have been conducted or carried on in the past?

Mr. SCOTT. There is not any intention, as far as I know, of taking on any new projects this year.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I observe the amount appropriated for this bureau for the next year is \$322,000 more than that for the current year, and more than 30 per cent additional. That is a pretty large increase for the work carried on in this bureau.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman must be mistaken in his figures. The estimates ask for an increase in this bureau of \$96,560. The committee has allowed a total increase of \$72,000 only.

Mr. DRISCOLL. The present law carries a total of \$1,080,860, and this carries a total of \$1,402,860, which, as I have figured out, is an increase of \$322,000 in this bureau. That is a pretty large increase for the ordinary growth of the bureau and for doing the ordinary work—

Mr. COCKS of New York. They have put in something for this foot-and-mouth disease. I do not know how much.

Mr. DRISCOLL (continuing). Especially when our deficit is growing all the time and was about \$15,000,000 during the last month.

Mr. SCOTT. The total appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry for 1909 was \$1,330,860.

Mr. DRISCOLL. There must have been some shifting of it somewhere. I want to know whether it is proposed to take on any new work during the next year not included in the Bureau of Animal Industry during the last year.

Mr. SCOTT. The explanation probably is in the fact that last year there was carried as a separate appropriation \$250,000 for the eradication of the cattle tick, and that is included in the general expense account here this year instead of being carried as an emergency measure.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Is that carried here in the appropriation for the Bureau of Animal Industry?

Mr. SCOTT. In last year's bill the appropriation for the eradication of the cattle tick, \$250,000, was carried as an emergency appropriation and was not included in the total as shown in the law for the Bureau of Animal Industry. This year that \$250,000 is included. The amount is the same, and the work is not changed.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I withdraw the motion.

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Plant Industry: One plant physiologist and pathologist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$2,250; 1 editor, \$2,000; 1 superintendent of gardens and grounds, \$1,800; 1 officer in charge of records, \$2,000; 3 executive clerks, at \$1,980 each; 4 clerks, class 4; 8 clerks, class 3; 1 clerk, \$1,500; 13 clerks, class 2; 31 clerks, class 1; 1 seed clerk and superintendent, \$1,200; 1 clerk, \$1,080; 19 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 15 clerks, at \$900 each; 16 clerks, at \$840 each; 1 clerk, \$800; 13 clerks, at \$720 each; 8 clerks, messengers, or laborers, at \$660 each; 15 clerks, messengers, or laborers, at \$600 each; 1 assistant photographer, \$600; 1 carpenter, \$900; 1 carpenter, \$840; 2 gardeners or assistants, at \$1,000 each; 6 gardeners, at \$900 each; 2 gardeners, at \$840 each; 4 gardeners, at \$780 each; 5 gardeners, at \$720 each; 3 gardeners, at \$660 each; 1 gardener, \$600; 1 skilled laborer, \$900; 1 skilled laborer, \$840; 1 painter, \$840; 2 plumbers, at \$840 each; 8 skilled laborers, at \$720 each; 4 skilled laborers, at \$540 each; 14 skilled laborers, messengers, or messenger boys, at \$480 each; 4 messenger boys, at \$360 each; 3 messenger boys, at \$300 each; in all, \$210,510.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I move to strike out the last word.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I will make or reserve a point of order on the three executive clerks.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I wish to offer an amendment. I move to strike out of page 12, line 25—

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will first dispose of the point of order.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I make the point of order against the words "three executive clerks," in line 4, page 13, as creating new offices, not authorized by law.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, two of these clerks are new to this bill. One was provided in the last bill. So that the total number is now three clerks, with only two of them new. It seems to me that the point of order against them is not well taken, because the Secretary of Agriculture is certainly author-

ized by law to employ all the clerks, assistants, and other persons he may need to perform the duty imposed upon him. I ask for a ruling upon the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York make the point of order?

Mr. DRISCOLL. I reserved it; I wanted to know if the gentleman had shifted either of these clerks from some other line of service and whether they were paid from some other appropriation; if so, I would not have minded. But now, since the gentleman wants a ruling, I want to see any authority for two of these places at \$1,980 each.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this matter was considered, and very carefully, by the committee, and it was the judgment of the committee that the bureau chiefs made a good case in asking for this increase. The Bureau of Plant Industry is managed with very great discretion and good judgment, and it is the opinion of your committee that these two places are needed in order to carry out the work of the bureau. It seems to me clear that the point of order can not lie against them, and I will ask a ruling of the Chair.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from New York make the point of order?

Mr. DRISCOLL. Well, yes; I make it now.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman from Kansas inform the Chair as to the statute which gives to the Secretary of Agriculture the authority he referred to a moment ago?

Mr. SCOTT. The organic act establishing the department authorizes the Secretary of Agriculture to employ such "clerks, assistants, and other persons" as he may need to carry into effect the provisions of the act. I quote from memory, but I am quite sure I am not mistaken about it.

Mr. DRISCOLL. Mr. Chairman, in order to save time, I withdraw the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is withdrawn.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I move to amend, page 12, line 25, by striking out at the end of the line the word "two" and inserting the word "five," and in line 1, page 13, strike out the words "and fifty."

Mr. MACON. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I expected that of the gentleman.

Mr. MACON. Whenever the gentleman undertakes to violate the rules of this House he may expect it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I am aware of the fact that the gentleman is always on the lookout.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman will please repeat his amendment, in order that the Clerk may get it.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Line 25, page 12, strike out the word "two," at the end of the line, and insert "five;" and in line 1, page 13, strike out the words "and fifty."

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 12, line 25, strike out the word "two," at the end of the line, and insert "five;" and in line 1, page 13, strike out the words "and fifty," so as to read "\$2,500."

Mr. SCOTT. I make the point of order against that.

Mr. MACON. I will say to the gentleman from Kansas, it is already made.

Mr. SCOTT. I was waiting until the amendment could be reported at the Clerk's desk.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. I withdraw the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

Mr. MACON. I object to the withdrawal of the amendment. I would like to have the Chair rule on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Objection is heard. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. HARDY. Mr. Chairman, I rise with some hesitation to move to strike out the last word, in order to ask for some information. I see in this bill, on this page, there are provisions for as many as 30 gardeners and assistant gardeners. What I want to know is where this gardening of the department is done, and what is the necessity for so many gardeners. The information I am anxious to secure, and what I want to understand, is what the department is doing that requires the employment of this many laborers in that line.

Mr. SCOTT. If the gentleman has visited the grounds around the Agricultural Department, he will have noticed there are extensive greenhouses, which are used in plant breeding and propagation and other plant-cultural work. The men who take care of these greenhouses are carried on the roll as gardeners. They are all kept busy, and their number is not greater than the work requires.

Mr. HARDY. Is most of that within the city limits and close to the department buildings?

Mr. SCOTT. It is all within the city of Washington, with the exception of some men who are employed on the Arlington experiment farm across the river.

Mr. HARDY. How large is that Arlington experiment farm? Mr. SCOTT. My recollection is that there are about 200 acres in the Arlington experiment farm.

Mr. HARDY. That is taken charge of by these men?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. HARDY. I withdraw the pro forma amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of grains and methods of grain production, \$63,910.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, a parliamentary inquiry. I should like to inquire of the Chair whether the lines now being read are considered as a part of one and the same paragraph, beginning at line 11, page 14, or whether each paragraph is considered as an independent paragraph? You will notice that at the end of line 23 there is a colon, and all these subsequent paragraphs end with semicolons.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state to the gentleman from Wisconsin that each one of these seems to be a separate paragraph.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have been waiting for what I supposed to be the end of the paragraph. Under the ruling of the Chair I ask unanimous consent to return to the bottom of page 15.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to return to the paragraph at the bottom of page 15. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I move to amend that paragraph by adding after the word "cotton," in line 23, the words "and wool," so that it will read:

For investigating the handling, grading, and baling of cotton and wool, and the establishment of standards for the different grades thereof.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I shall be obliged to reserve a point of order against that amendment.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Anticipating the point of order, I wish to call the matter to the attention of the committee when this bill is considered another year. It is of great importance to the growers of wool in my State and in other States that this matter of the grading of wool, equally with the grading of cotton, may receive governmental supervision and attention. I have found by reading on the subject and otherwise that the grading of wool in Australia has made a wonderful difference and been of very great value to the woolgrowers of that country; and I am sure that the artificial methods by which wool is now graded in the Boston and other markets could be greatly improved by governmental supervision. If it be held, as I apprehend it will be, that this amendment is subject to the point of order, I hope that the committee will bear it in mind at their hearings another year. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee what, if any, attention the committee have given to the matter of the grading of wool?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the committee considered the proposition of including an investigation along this line, with a view of improving the standards of the grades of wool, but decided not to recommend it in this bill, because the work of standardization of cotton has not yet been finished, and we thought it was better to finish one investigation before taking up another.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If I may be pardoned for interrupting, is not that investigation substantially finished?

Mr. SCOTT. It could hardly be said to be finished. It has come to the stage where we will determine pretty soon whether the work which has been done is of any value. A very important part of the work still remains to be done. I appreciate the importance of the suggestion of the gentleman, and can assure him that the committee will consider it at another time, but I shall be obliged at this time to insist upon my point of order.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I concede the point of order to be well taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the investigation and improvement of methods of growing, producing, and handling tobacco, \$30,530.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I offer an amendment, after the word "dollars," in line 23:

For experiments in the manufacture of paper from cornstalks, \$20,000.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 16, line 23, insert the following:

"For experiments in the manufacture of paper from cornstalks, \$20,000."

Mr. SCOTT. I reserve the point of order.

Mr. COLE. Mr. Chairman, I realize the appropriation called for by this amendment is subject to a point of order, but the subject-matter is of sufficient importance to receive congressional recognition. During the past year the Department of Agriculture has been making some experiments in the manufacture of paper from cornstalks and other fibrous plants in one of its chemical laboratories. The results obtained have been very gratifying. The finest quality of paper has been manufactured from cornstalks. It is a demonstrated fact that all grades of paper can be successfully made. Now, Mr. Chairman, this is an age of conservation. We recognized the necessity of practicing economy in the use of our natural resources. The whole question of conservation revolves around the preservation of our forests and our supply of timber. Government authorities assure us that at the present rate of consumption our present supply will be exhausted within a period of thirty years. Anything that tends to conserve that supply is worthy of consideration. The manufacture of pulp and paper is one of the greatest demands upon our forests at the present time. When a pulp factory is established in any timber land, as a rule it usually denudes that section. It uses all timber from 2 inches in diameter to the largest tree of the forest. As a result of the great consumption of wood the price of paper has greatly increased. Every newspaper in the country will testify to that fact.

Many papers have been compelled to cut down the size of their issues because of this increased cost. Therefore, any product that can be used in the manufacture of paper ought to be utilized. It would only cost about \$20,000, according to the estimate of the department, to equip a factory in the great corn-growing belt for the purpose of making this experiment. It would be a source of increased income to the farmers. Doctor Galloway, of the Bureau of Plant Industry, estimates that \$5 a ton can be paid for cornstalks and the manufacturer realize a reasonable profit on his investment. An acre of ordinary corn land in the United States produces from 3 to 5 tons. This excludes the husks and blades, which can be used for provender. From this statement it is evident that from fifteen to twenty dollars can be realized from this by-product that now is practically worthless. One ton of cornstalks will produce about as much paper as 1 ton of wood. Of course it is of much greater bulk than wood and would cost more for transportation. But if the factories were established in the corn-growing regions that element of cost could be greatly reduced. It occurs to me that an enterprise which would lessen the cost of print paper and bring millions of dollars into the pockets of the American farmers from a source that is now almost useless should receive encouragement at the hands of this Congress. [Applause.]

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he would have any objections to including the words "flax straw" in his amendment?

Mr. COLE. I have not any objection to including anything that can be used for the manufacture of paper that will lessen the tax on our forest reserve, so rapidly being exhausted in the making of pulp and paper. At this time, when we are expending so much of the public funds in the discovery of methods of increased production, it is certainly proper and expedient to devote a small appropriation to the utilization of the by-products of the farm. Here is a great product that is almost worthless to-day, great quantities of it unused and burned up in the springtime. Let us give the department authority and sufficient appropriation to perform this experiment and ascertain if this waste can not be made a source of profit to the farmer.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. GRONNA. Unless the gentleman insists on the point of order—

Mr. SCOTT. I insist on the point of order, but I thought the gentleman from Ohio had withdrawn the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment will be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

Mr. GRONNA. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I hoped that the gentleman from Ohio would not withdraw the amendment, and also I was in hopes that the gentleman from Kansas would not make an objection to an amendment of this kind. I am heartily in favor of the amendment offered by the gentleman from Ohio, especially because he was willing to include flax straw. We raise in the western country, in our State alone, more than 3,000,000 tons of flax straw that is burned up every year. We burn up more flax straw than would be required for the manufacture of white paper to supply

the United States. I believe now is the time to make a small appropriation for this purpose.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GRONNA. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. Is the gentleman aware that flax straw is used for commercial manufactured paper now?

Mr. GRONNA. I am aware of that, but I am also aware that it is not used to any great extent.

Mr. MANN. It is as far as it is profitable to use it. It does not require any experimentation.

Mr. GRONNA. It does require an experimentation. I also believe it is profitable as an article for the manufacture of paper. It requires two and a half tons of flax straw to make a ton of white paper.

Mr. MANN. It requires a great deal more than that.

Mr. GRONNA. You can pay \$5 to \$7 a ton for flax straw, and yet it would be cheaper than the price we are paying for wood. I am heartily in favor of such an amendment to this bill as is proposed by the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. DRISCOLL. I would like to ask the gentleman if the question of transportation would not be an important factor? You might have straw enough, but not be able to get it to the mill.

Mr. GRONNA. I will say in reply to the gentleman from New York that it is possible to establish these factories right in the center of where the flax straw is grown. The gentleman from Ohio well says that this is the time when we want to conserve our forests, and this is an annual recurring crop. It takes from 80 to 120 years to grow a saw log, and it takes only a year to grow a crop of flax or cornstalks, and I hope the gentleman from Kansas will not make the point of order against the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, nobody on the floor of this House is more anxious to promote the manufacture of paper from cornstalks and flax and other by-products of the farm than am I. However, I shall feel obliged to make the point of order against this proposed amendment, for the reason that it is not necessary, in my judgment, at this time. This bill carries a paragraph "to enable the Secretary of Agriculture to test such plants as may require tests, to ascertain if they be suitable for making paper, \$10,000, or so much thereof as may be necessary." Under that appropriation, which is carried in the current act, investigations have been made in which it has been fully demonstrated that paper can be made from cornstalks, and I have before me here a book of samples of paper ranging all the way from rough wrapping paper to a very high grade of writing paper manufactured from that material. The laboratory tests are complete, and it has been demonstrated beyond question that paper ranging all through the qualities I have named can be manufactured from cornstalks.

Mr. COOPER of Wisconsin. Where was that made?

Mr. SCOTT. The samples were made, as I understand it, in the laboratories at Washington. The bureau having charge of this work has now arranged for a commercial test with one of the New England mills, and until that test has been made it seems to me unnecessary to carry an appropriation for any further investigation into the subject. It certainly is being looked after with all possible diligence, and I do not think any good would be gained by inserting the amendment proposed at this time.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the gentleman if there is a patent on that?

Mr. SCOTT. There are no patents, I think. Perhaps there may be a patent on some of these processes, but things which are developed through the investigation of the Government, of course, are protected by the bureau making the discovery.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Is the gentleman certain about that?

Mr. SCOTT. I understand the practice of the Department of Agriculture to be, whenever it develops a machine, a device, or any sort of a method of any kind which is patentable, to patent it for the benefit of the people, and thus protect it from private monopoly.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that the amendment having been withdrawn, we are proceeding by unanimous consent. There is nothing pending.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I move to strike out the last word, and I may want to move to strike out the word "two" and insert the word "one," making it \$10,000 instead of \$20,000, and I offer that amendment now.

Mr. SCOTT. May I suggest to the gentleman from Tennessee that a discussion of the question of manufacturing paper might more properly come when we reach the paragraph especially providing for that investigation?

Mr. MANN. I may say to the gentleman also that I propose to offer an amendment on this subject, following line 3, page 17, where a discussion will be appropriate.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. At that time I want to discuss this patent matter also.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For general plant breeding and cooperative plant-breeding demonstrations, \$14,840.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk and ask to have read.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 17, after line 3, insert:

"For the testing of such plants as may require tests to ascertain if they be suitable for making paper, \$10,000."

Mr. SCOTT. I reserve the point of order as against that.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I think it is not subject to a point of order. It is in the language of the item in the bill, which item I offered last year in Committee of the Whole and which ran the gantlet of the point of order, and the point of order was overruled.

Mr. SCOTT. My point of order would be that it would be a duplication of language that may be in the bill.

Mr. MANN. If the point of order be that it is duplication of language in the bill, then it is for the committee to determine where in the bill the language shall occur and under what bureau.

Mr. COLE. Wherein does that amendment differ from the amendment which I offered?

Mr. MANN. If I get a chance to, I will explain it. It is the point of order now that I would like to have disposed of.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair understands the point of order to be that the language of the amendment duplicates something already in the bill. The Chair thinks it is entirely proper for the Committee to duplicate language if it desires to do so. The point of order is therefore overruled.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I offer the amendment at this place so that it may be under the Bureau of Plant Industry. The item in the bill is now under the head of "Miscellaneous," simply authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to make these experiments. My object in offering the amendment is to have the investigation carried on by the Bureau of Plant Industry, for the purpose of testing, as far as may be tested, annual plants or other plants, annual or perennial, herbaceous or otherwise, which may be used in the manufacture of paper. In this connection I want to say just a word or two in regard to the cornstalk experiment. The experiment so far carried on in reference to the manufacture of paper from cornstalks would indicate that the idea is purely chimerical. While paper can be manufactured from cornstalks, it is also true that paper can be manufactured from expensive orchids, but it is not a commercial probability that it ever will be done. I do not intend to detain the committee this morning, because I hope in a few days to have time in general debate to give some time to this subject of the methods of manufacturing paper. It takes one cord of spruce wood to make a ton of ground wood, all of which is used in the production of paper. It takes about nine cords of cornstalks to produce one ton of fiber, and most of this fiber is not fit for paper making, so far as has yet been demonstrated. A ton of cornstalks will produce about 250 pounds of good fiber, which can be used in the manufacture of paper. It will produce in addition about 550 pounds of pith pulp, the pulp that comes from the pith in the cornstalks, which it may be possible to utilize in the future, but for the use of which no one yet has discovered any purpose. From this ton of cornstalks you produce in addition about 300 pounds of what is called "stock food," and the chemist—

Mr. DRISCOLL. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MANN. In just a moment—and the gentleman who made the experiment informed our committee that out of this 300 pounds of so-called "stock food" there would be chemically contained from 40 to 44 per cent of saccharine matter, but when it was analyzed by the Bureau of Chemistry instead of being 40 to 44 per cent it was less than 4 per cent, and some of it less than 2 per cent of saccharine matter, making a very great difference in the value of it as a by-product. I yield now to the gentleman from New York for a relevant question. [Laughter.]

Mr. DRISCOLL. Just a question. The gentleman said it would take 9 tons of cornstalks to make 1 ton of fiber. Were these stalks dry or green when weighed?

Mr. MANN. Did I say 9 tons? I said 9 cords.

Mr. DRISCOLL. What is a cord of cornstalks?

Mr. MANN. I knew the gentleman would not ask a relevant question—

Mr. DRISCOLL. It strikes me that is a relevant question; what is a cord of cornstalks?

Mr. MANN. What is a cord of cornstalks? When you transport any article by freight the space it occupies is a very important question. You can transport a cord of spruce wood to the mill and it will make a ton of paper. It will take 9 cords, 9 times the space in a freight car, to transport the same amount of cornstalks to produce the paper. Now, if it were practical to grind up cornstalks and bale them, that could be done, but the moment cornstalks are ground up they commence to heat and the moment you commence to bale them they commence to heat and they are of no value at all. The great difficulty with farmers in the country when they make corn stover is to keep it from spoiling by heating and molding.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended five minutes for the purpose of addressing himself, if he will, to the question of why that amendment should be carried under this item in the bill rather than under the general miscellaneous item.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from Illinois shall proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MANN. Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope no gentleman will divert me from the course of my remarks by another irrelevant question, although it may be a very pertinent question. I do not criticize the gentleman for asking the question. It is highly desirable that the department should make investigations of these annual plants for possibilities of paper making in the future. Reference has been made here, for instance, to the fact that paper has been made from cornstalks. I have in my possession a statement from the company which has done all of this work, so far as the paper making is concerned, and who have been carrying on these experiments for years, and they say frankly that they do not consider that the manufacture of paper from annual plants is to-day a commercial possibility, but that as the price of pulp material increases in the future it will become desirable to be able to obtain something besides wood to make this cheaper paper, and that they hope to be able through experiments to develop something which in the future may be of service. Take cornstalks, for instance. The manufacture of paper from cornstalks as a by-product of the farm is, in my opinion, out of the question, but by proper plant breeding it may be possible and practicable to produce a cornstalk rich in fiber, cultivated not for the purpose of producing the corn itself, but for the purpose of producing the fiber, which can be raised for the purpose of making paper, not merely as a by-product, but as the very object of the raising.

The same is true of various other annual plants. The Bureau of Plant Industry has connections throughout the world with large numbers of plants. It has been proposed for us to experiment with bamboo, as Japan is now experimenting, and for us to experiment with other annual or perennial plants which we may obtain; and for that reason this money ought to be under the control of the Bureau of Plant Industry. The \$10,000 which was appropriated last year has been practically wasted, not but that they may have learned something through the testing plant put up here, but all the information which has been learned so far was already known in the paper world.

I do not wish to be understood as criticising the department. They had to learn the subject themselves, as they knew very little about it; but there is now in the department Doctor Cobb, connected with the Bureau of Plant Industry, and probably the best-informed man in the world on the subject of the fiber in plants, and I believe that if under that bureau they were given the appropriation and permitted to experiment, not with paper making, but with the testing of plants and the fiber in plants, and producing plants full of fiber which may be used, they would be able to be of great service to the country. The testing as to paper making will be readily done by many of the paper manufacturers in their laboratories and in their plants, where it is impossible for them now to obtain plants themselves with which to make the tests, both for lack of opportunity to obtain the plants and lack of knowledge in regard to the fiber in plants.

Mr. STEPHENS of Texas. Will the gentleman yield to a question? I wish to ask in reference to cotton fiber. Does the gentleman know whether or not that has been sufficiently tested for paper? I have seen a statement to the effect that they have been successful.

Mr. MANN. A test of the cotton fiber is now being carried on. So far as it has been used it has not been a success, although you will find highly colored descriptions of stock for

sale in companies who would lead you to believe it was a great thing. The test of okra has not been fairly made, and I do not say that the test of cotton stalk has not been fairly made, but I am satisfied that the people who have made the tests have absolutely no confidence in the future use of cotton fiber or cornstalks to any extent for paper making unless by breeding you produce a different plant.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, Doctor Galloway, Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, when before the committee, was questioned on this subject and said:

The paper work has been carried on in cooperation with the Forest Service. The Forest Service has a laboratory in Washington that is available for certain phases of the work, and by an arrangement with the experts in that service they have carried on the tests with plants that have been brought here for the purpose.

Mr. Pinchot, the Chief of the Forest Service, when before the committee, was asked whether he had anything to report as to the paper investigation. He said:

Yes; we have quite a good deal. We have established the practicality of making merchantable pulp from a considerable number of woods, about a dozen, other than the ones that have been used hitherto. We have a laboratory here in Washington in which we try various species from all over the country, and we find that good wood pulp can be made from a large number of trees that have never been used for that purpose.

Mr. MANN. If the gentleman will permit, I may say that those experiments have not been made under this appropriation at all—that is, those experiments as to woods.

Mr. SCOTT. Whether they are made under this appropriation or not, the extracts from the hearings which I have read make it clear that there is a perfectly harmonious cooperation between the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Forest Service in this investigation. And that being true, I confess I can not see any point to be gained by transferring the investigation so that it will be exclusively under the jurisdiction of the Plant Industry Bureau. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has said, the work is now in charge of Doctor Cobb, to whom he pays a deserved tribute, and all of the operations are being carried on under his direction, subject, of course, to the general oversight of the chief of the bureau and of the Secretary of Agriculture. As the language reads in the current law and in the pending bill, the whole matter rests with the Secretary of Agriculture, and if he believes that better results can be obtained by having the investigations conducted exclusively by the Bureau of Plant Industry, he is not prohibited from making such direction.

It certainly seems to me that we ought not to put anything in this bill which possibly might be construed as taking away from the Forest Service a continuation of any investigation which it has made. It must be of great utility to discover that wood pulp can be made from varieties of timber which up to this time have not been available. Undoubtedly such discoveries have been made as the result of the investigations already concluded, and I can see no object to be attained in the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois. I trust therefore it will be voted down, so that the bill may remain as it is now.

Mr. GRONNA. I move to strike out the last word. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. I know he is very well posted on this particular question, the same as he is on all others on which he has made a study. I want to find out if the committee of which the gentleman is a member has made an investigation as to whether any tests have been made as to the manufacture of paper from flax straw.

Mr. MANN. There have been no tests made by the Government.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to state that I understand that there has been some paper made from flax straw, but there is a patent on the process of bleaching.

Mr. MANN. I think the gentleman is mistaken about there being a patent on the process of bleaching.

Mr. GRONNA. I so understood.

Mr. MANN. The retting of flax straw for linen is one thing that would not be required in making it ready for use in making paper. They are using a flax straw in Minneapolis and up in that country for a character of paper.

Mr. GRONNA. I want to say to the gentleman that in a letter from Doctor Drewson, of New York, a noted chemist, he states that it takes just 2½ tons of flax straw to make a ton of paper, or 40 per cent of paper can be made from flax straw; and I understand there is a patent, or at least a patent pending, on the bleaching process of this particular paper.

Mr. MANN. Well, the bleaching process is a simple thing. You can bleach anything in the way of a fiber to-day by putting a little chlorine in it. Flax straw is no different from other things. All really white paper is bleached, taking the same

process practically for one as for the other. The patented process which has been experimented with by the Agricultural Department is probably the one to which the gentleman from Tennessee refers as the process by which the fiber is separated from the pith. All annual plants contain a considerable amount of pith; cornstalks contain notably a large amount of pith. You can not manufacture paper to advantage without separating the fiber from the pith, and there is a patented process which has been used by the department here, and they are the ones largely interested in pushing the cornstalk proposition, by which they successfully separate the pith from the real cellulose fiber.

Mr. GRONNA. I thank the gentleman for the information.

Mr. COOPER of Pennsylvania. I would like to ask the gentleman from Illinois, in what branch of the Agricultural Department is being conducted the experiment of making paper?

Mr. MANN. In the Bureau of Plant Industry and Bureau of Forestry.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, I want to read from the present bill, on page 46, beginning with line 16, where I think this same matter is incorporated in the bill, for it reads as follows:

To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to test such plants as may require tests to ascertain if they be suitable for making paper.

Now, the only difference between this provision that is now in the bill and the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois is, that he desires to limit the work and desires to take it out of the hands of the Secretary of Agriculture, the head of that great department, and place it under the direction of the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry. That, it seems to me, ought not to be done. It seems to me this matter, as well as all other matters relating to investigations in that department, ought to be left under the direction of the head of the whole department. As he has the general supervision over all the work, if he desires to have that work done, and if in his judgment it can be done better by the Bureau of Plant Industry, he can have it done there. On the other hand, if he thinks it can be best accomplished by a system of cooperation between the Bureau of Plant Industry and the Bureau of Forestry, he can direct to have it done in that way. It seems to me it ought to be left in his hands.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman is a member of the committee reporting the bill. Can he find any other item in the bill which is not put under the head of one of the particular bureaus? He thinks they ought all to be under the Secretary; can he find another item in the bill that is not under one of the bureaus?

Mr. POLLARD. As a matter of fact, as the gentleman's provision now is, it only makes a limitation and puts it into the hands of the Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Mr. MANN. I offer this amendment, which will put it in the same class, the same as any other item. The same relating to paper. If the gentleman thinks this amendment is unreasonable, he thereby condemns every other item in the bill.

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, I do not agree with the gentleman.

Mr. MANN. Of course the gentleman does not.

Mr. POLLARD. Every appropriation in this bill, from one end of it to the other, is under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture. The provision in the bill as it now stands authorizes the Secretary, as I have said, to carry on this investigation, and I see no object to be gained in taking it out of his hands.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to have the attention of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I should like to know where his amendment comes in; the page and line?

Mr. MANN. I offered the amendment to follow the paragraph concerning plant breeding, after line 3, on page 17.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I should like to have the amendment reported again.

The CHAIRMAN. If there be no objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment.

The amendment was again read.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I should like to ask the chairman of the committee reporting the bill what is his exact objection to this? Does he object to the proposition entirely, or does he object to the place at which it is offered in the bill?

Mr. SCOTT. My objection to the amendment is that it seems to restrict the investigations wholly to the Bureau of Plant Industry; whereas I believe that to a considerable extent they may be carried on under the Bureau of Forestry. I think, in other words, that the language of the present bill, which authorizes free cooperation, may well be allowed to remain.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Are not all the departments of the forestry and plant departments under the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. SCOTT. Undoubtedly.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Then that is rather a technical objection, is it not?

Mr. SCOTT. It is rather technical, and yet after the provision has been carried apart from any bureau, as a paragraph by itself, and Congress then particularly and specifically picks it out and puts it under a given bureau, it seems to me that the Secretary might well construe it as being the intent of Congress to limit the investigations to that bureau.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I understand the gentleman from Illinois disclaims that intention. Mr. Chairman, whether the amendment comes in here or not, I do hope some such amendment as this will be made to the bill somewhere. Exactly where it ought to be, I am not familiar enough with the bill to say.

Mr. POLLARD. The gentleman says he hopes the item will be inserted in the bill. If he will turn to page 46, beginning with line 16, he will find the identical amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, except that it is not limited.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. I have that before me. Now, I want to ask the gentleman from Illinois why he puts this amendment in here?

Mr. MANN. This is where it belongs, under the Bureau of Plant Industry. Like all the other items that relate to the handling of annual plants, this item ought to be under the Bureau of Plant Industry, where the money will be profitably expended. We have examined before the special Pulp and Paper Committee all of the people who have had to do with the experiments of the last year, and I want to say that, in my judgment, so far as value to the country is concerned, they have wasted the money undoubtedly. They have helped to give themselves necessary education. They were like the rest of us; they did not know very much about it.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If the amendment is adopted where you propose it, it will still be in the Agricultural Department and under the direction of the Secretary of Agriculture.

Mr. MANN. Oh, certainly.

Mr. DOUGLAS. The gentleman of course contemplates striking out the provision on page 46?

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to inquire of the gentleman from Illinois, in case this amendment carries, whether experimentation could be made in this Bureau of Plant Industry on any plants except annual plants? Could they be made upon wood generally?

Mr. MANN. They could be made, of course, upon anything; but I may say to the gentleman, so far as the question of wood is concerned, they have learned nothing new, either in the Bureau of Forestry or anywhere else, in regard to the use of wood. Practically all kinds of wood are now used for paper making, so far as they are commercially profitable.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it the gentleman's judgment that the effect of the transfer of this item would be to limit the experiments to annual plants only?

Mr. MANN. My own judgment is that if they use the money profitably they will use it in connection with the development of annual and perennial plants—probably largely in perennial plants, which grow from the roots and are cut down each year.

Mr. MARTIN. Would it not have the effect to abandon the experiment in miscellaneous wood fiber?

Mr. MANN. Not at all. The Forestry Service is conducting experiments in regard to the use of wood, but not a single one has been made out of this fund, and not one of them has been made since this money was appropriated. We had the Bureau of Forestry before us, and they testified as to their experiments. We had this testimony before this was law at all.

Mr. MARTIN. What experiments have been carried on under this item?

Mr. MANN. They have experimented in Washington on cornstalks, with a grass that grows in California, with rice straw, and have collected together some cotton stalks. They have experimented mainly for the purpose of showing whether a certain patented process could be profitably used by the Government. That is what the main experiment has been for. I do not like to say that, but that is the fact, and I do not think it is a proper expenditure of money.

Mr. MARTIN. Under what bureau has the experimentation been carried on?

Mr. MANN. Under the direction of the Forestry Service, which I do not wish to criticize in this direction. They did not know anything about the making of paper, or paper material, contemplated by the bill. They had to learn. I have been on the Paper and Pulp Committee for a year, and we have learned a good deal and do not know much now. But in every step we have taken if we had known then what we know now, before we took a step, we might have taken a better step or not taken it at all.

Mr. MARTIN. Does not the gentleman think it likely that if we take advantage of what little has been learned and keep on in that direction we might make some progress?

Mr. MANN. We have not learned anything except as to whether a certain patented process could be profitably used to separate fiber from the pith. The Warren mills made paper out of cornstalks years and years and years ago. That is where this paper that we have here is made, not by the Government, but in the Warren mills. I have a letter from Mr. Warren, in which he says that they have been experimenting on this subject for years, but never yet have they reached the point where it was commercially profitable, or where it looked as though it would be in the near future.

Mr. MARTIN. Under the terms of the bill, the Secretary could direct the experiments to be had in the Bureau of Plant Industry.

Mr. MANN. The Secretary of Agriculture is not posted on this subject. I make no reflection upon him when I say that he does not know anything about paper making, and that what he does not know would fill quite a volume.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman a question.

Mr. MANN. I have not the floor; but I will answer the gentleman.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. What experiments have been made with cotton stalks and marsh grasses, if the gentleman knows?

Mr. MANN. There has been considerable experimentation made with cotton stalks, but cotton stalks are very bulky when you come to gather them, more so than cornstalks; and while you can make good paper or good fiber, it is not the opinion of those who have investigated the subject that it will ever be profitable to make paper out of cotton stalks as cotton stalks are now raised.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. How about the marsh grass?

Mr. MANN. There have been experiments made on various marsh grasses. If the gentleman will read the bulletin issued by the Pulp and Paper Committee, he will find a letter from abroad on that subject which is very interesting. When they undertake to collect the grass which grows in the marshes of the South for paper making, the cost of collection up to the present time has been prohibitive as to cheap paper, and as to the more expensive paper, it does not compete with rag paper.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. It fails in quality. Now, does not the gentleman think that this amount ought to be increased to \$20,000 instead of \$10,000?

Mr. MANN. I think \$10,000 is all they want. I have discussed this matter with Doctor Galloway, Chief of the Bureau of Plant Industry, along the line of making an investigation of these plants. While I do not undertake to quote him at all, or express his opinion, still I think I know what he wants.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I am in accord with the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. I move that all debate on this paragraph and amendments thereto close in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I am heartily in accord with what the gentleman from Illinois has said and with the particular object and purpose of his amendment, but I am inclined to believe that there is a mistaken idea among some of the members of the committee. I understood that the amendment of the gentleman from Illinois was directed chiefly to the breeding of fibrous plants that might be tested and successfully used in the manufacture of paper. I ascertained more recently, however, that there was a dispute, if I may use that word, as to which bureau or department of the Government should particularly have charge of testing material for the making of paper.

Mr. MANN. I hope the gentleman from Minnesota will not use that word; I never have heard the term used, or any question of dispute, and I do not think there is anything in it.

Mr. DAVIS. Then I withdraw the word "dispute." I used it gingerly to ascertain the nature—

Mr. MANN. I do not think there is any dispute between the departments about it at all.

Mr. DAVIS. Mr. Chairman, I would suggest the following amendment as a substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

Mr. DAVIS. It may not be in proper language, and I would like to read it from my place on the floor. After the word "dollars," in line 3, on page 17, insert the following:

For breeding of fibrous plants which may be used for paper making, \$10,000.

The paragraph under discussion is for general plant breeding and cooperative plant breeding demonstrations, \$14,840. That is not directed at any specific proposition, and the object of the substitute amendment which I propose is particularly to call the attention of the Bureau of Plant Industry to this proposition, that \$10,000 shall be used for the purpose of demonstrating by plant breeding any fibrous plants that in their judgment might be used for paper making.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. DAVIS. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I would have no objection to the amendment of the gentleman, which would be subject to the point of order if the point of order were made. I think myself that the gentleman's amendment is better than mine, although I offered one not subject to the point of order.

Mr. DAVIS. Well, will the gentleman accept this as a substitute providing the Chairman does not rule it is subject to the point of order?

Mr. MANN. It would be perfectly agreeable if no point of order is made.

Mr. DAVIS. I think, Mr. Chairman, this would solve the problem, and it would fit in very admirably with the provisions of the bill on page 46, under the item of "Miscellaneous," which reads as follows:

Paper tests: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to test such plants as may require tests to ascertain if they be suitable for making paper.

Now, that would be all right. The \$10,000 there could be properly used for the purpose for which it is specified by the Secretary of Agriculture; but if the Bureau of Plant Industry could breed a plant or plants and thus improve the fibrous quality thereof for paper making that this amendment of mine seeks to have them do, it certainly would not conflict in any way with the appropriation of \$10,000 on page 46.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Minnesota has expired. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota as a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

Mr. MANN. The amendment has not been reported yet, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. DAVIS. I have offered this amendment verbally from my place.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Substitute for the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois the following:
"For breeding fibrous plants which may be used for paper making, \$10,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I believe I will ask for a division on that question.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 41, noes 23.

So the amendment was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois, as amended by the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I understood the amendment offered by the gentleman from Minnesota is in the nature of a substitute to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Illinois.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair stated the question correctly, that the amendment was offered in the nature of a substitute.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, may we have the amendment and substitute reported?

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the Clerk will again report the amendment and substitute amendment.

The amendment and the substitute amendment were again reported.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, as I understood that amendment, it was not for the purpose of making paper, but for growing plants out of which we are to make paper.

Mr. DAVIS. Yes.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. If it is in order, I would like to offer an amendment on that patent question to this effect:

Provided, That all discoveries in making paper by the Department of Agriculture shall be patented in the name of the Secretary of Agriculture for the use and benefit of the United States and the people thereof.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk reported the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. I will reserve the point of order on that.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to withdraw that amendment for the present, and I will offer it later.

The CHAIRMAN. Without objection, the amendment may be withdrawn.

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For the study and demonstration of the best methods of meeting the ravages of the cotton boll weevil, \$146,470.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This is a matter of very great, in fact of vital, importance to a number of us here. I want to ask the chairman of the committee something about it. The recommendation of the official under whom this appropriation will be administered was for an increase of \$150,000. The increase carried in this bill is a little less than \$50,000. I will ask the chairman of the committee if he does not believe it would be the part of wisdom for the House to grant a larger appropriation than that carried in this bill?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the committee considered this matter very carefully, having the advantage of the advice of the gentleman from Mississippi and others on this floor, who appeared before the committee to represent the interests in their localities, and the committee, as a result of its deliberations, has recommended the amount that appears in the bill.

I should like to call the attention of the gentleman from Mississippi to the fact that while only \$146,470 is carried in this particular paragraph for this work, there is carried under the Bureau of Entomology \$42,000; so that the total amount available for work in combating the boll weevil is about \$190,000. In addition to this amount, as the gentleman well knows, there is a considerable sum available through the National Educational Board, which is used in cooperation with the officials of the Bureau of Plant Industry in carrying on the work which they are doing for the purpose of combating the boll weevil; and, still further, considerable sums are contributed by the localities, not as great as ought to be, in my judgment, yet enough to very largely increase the total amount. It is the opinion of your committee that we ought to give for this purpose a little less than is actually needed, rather than quite as much or a little more, because if we give not quite so much it certainly has a tendency to stimulate local contributions; and in work of this character, which is not investigational so much as it is demonstrational, it is the judgment of the committee that localities immediately benefited ought to contribute at least a reasonable portion of the expense.

Mr. DOUGLAS. If the gentleman from Mississippi will yield for a moment while I ask a question I desire to ask of the gentleman in charge of the bill, I will be much obliged.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. I yield.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I have a memorandum here to ask the well-informed chairman of the committee why it is that an appropriation of \$150,000 is carried in one bureau and \$42,000 in another bureau for identically the same purpose?

Mr. SCOTT. Because the work is carried forward along two entirely separate lines. The work of the Bureau of Plant Industry is to demonstrate by cultural methods, the selection of seed, and in other similar ways how cotton may be grown in spite of the boll weevil. The work of the Bureau of Entomology is to follow the life history of the weevil and attempt to get at the problem from that point of view, to ascertain what method may be best used to assist in its extermination. And they are having very gratifying success along that line, I may say, particularly in the direction of the introduction of parasites from other countries.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the chairman of the committee about that appropriation for the Bureau of Entomology. We have not yet reached it, but he has suggested it. The conditions of life, it is thought by the Chief of the Bureau of Entomology, in the delta sections of Mississippi and Louisiana are very different from the conditions of life under which the boll weevil has heretofore existed, and in the opinion of that bureau it is worth while to make a particular study of the weevil in those localities, and he is anxious to have a sufficient fund to establish an entomological laboratory there. I will ask the chairman now if the increase carried in the paragraph appropriating \$42,000 for the Bureau of Entomology, to which he has referred, is intended by the committee to be applied by the chief of that bureau for that purpose?

Mr. SCOTT. I would prefer to discuss the Bureau of Entomology when we get to it, but since the gentleman has asked the question I will answer it by saying that it is the expectation that with the increased appropriation it will be possible to establish the laboratory to which he refers.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. And that is the intention?

Mr. SCOTT. The increase was made with that expectation.

Mr. HUMPHREYS of Mississippi. Mr. Chairman, I have a good many figures and statements from those who are in po-

sition to understand this question of the boll weevil thoroughly, the extent of its ravages, and so forth, that are very interesting to those parts of the country that are now affected, and I will ask, for that reason, permission to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The gentleman from Kansas is mistaken, I think, when he says that the general education board is contributing to this fund. Their allotments go exclusively to States unaffected by the weevil, the effort being to notify the farmers of the approaching danger, and by introducing these new processes to prepare them for the wrath to come. I am not complaining, however, about the appropriation which is carried in this bill. It is an increase of some \$50,000 over the amount provided in the last bill, and I suppose I can say without violating any confidences that it is not only the expectation but the intention that an equal additional increase will be put on in the Senate. In the light of our past experiences, I believe I can say that this will be seed sown upon fertile soil and will return to us an hundredfold.

In discussing the question of cotton production in the Southern States, it is difficult for anyone not conversant with conditions there to understand its vital relation to our people and that in most of the South it is the principal cash crop, and in a large portion of the South the sole cash crop; and, consequently, financial conditions are very sensitive to the question of cotton-crop production.

I believe that it is of the highest importance to maintain this crop and that we can not readily change to a diversified agriculture that shall omit cotton; and, in my opinion, it would not be wise to do so, because cotton is one of the great staples of the world. The boll weevil from Mexico has invaded the cotton territory and proven an enemy of no insignificant force in this question of production; but the damage due to actual destruction of cotton in sections where the boll weevil has first appeared has been grossly exaggerated, and it is evident from investigations that I have made that a successful crop of cotton can be grown in spite of the boll weevil if the right methods are followed. There may be some years when it will be less and some years when it will be more, but a good average can be produced even with the boll weevil at its worst. Study of the effect of the weevil on the Texas crop before and since it has covered the entire cotton-producing portions of that State has given me greater confidence in the future of the cotton industry than I had before.

There is always a class of people who take the pessimistic side of every question and seem to glory in alarming somebody, or, if there be any alarm, in intensifying its effect. There are two elements of disaster which attend the invasion of the boll weevil, one results from the actual destruction of cotton and the other from the condition of panic which takes possession of every community upon the arrival of the pest, and I am not sure which is the greater. Sane men, cool men, men who are conservative in all the affairs of life are startled to such alarm as has not been witnessed since General Grant landed his army at Bruinsburg. Bankers decline to extend further credit to merchants upon whom the farmer must rely for the assistance necessary to make a crop, and the tenant thus deserted must seek other fields of endeavor. Plantations are either deserted or sowed to some other crop, and when as a necessary result of such conditions the cotton yield of that particular section falls off materially from the average yield, that fact is heralded on the wings of the morning to strike further terror to the territory yet to be invaded. The alarm caused by the approach of no invading army in the history of the world ever bore such abnormal relation to actual devastation in its rear as the terror which the threatened attack of the boll weevil bears to the actual work which he does. In front of him men are fleeing the cotton field and in some instances sacrificing their property, while behind him the fields are still white in waving beauty and real estate higher than ever before.

I would not be understood as minimizing the seriousness of the situation which confronts us, nor of underestimating the damage which we are sure to suffer; but I do believe that the disaster which must befall every community, if all credit is withheld by the banks, can be largely averted if we can get not only the truth, but the whole truth, before those whose judgment must direct the conduct of the banks.

The problem which confronts the planter in the Mississippi Delta is twofold. He must allay the panic which is liable to take possession of his tenant and his banker, not one or the other, but both, and to do this he must answer the question, Can cotton be profitably grown in spite of the boll weevil? In order to answer this let us inquire, Has it been done elsewhere? Can it be done in this delta? and first, Has it been done elsewhere?

The Department of Agriculture has answered this question most emphatically. The Bureau of Entomology, under the

efficient direction of its chief, Doctor Howard, and the division of farm demonstration work, under Doctor Knapp, have rendered invaluable service to the cotton planters and to the country by their ceaseless labors, and I wish now to make my bow to them both. I shall have more to say about the work of the Bureau of Entomology when we reach that paragraph in the bill; but as we are now considering the item which carries the appropriation for the farm demonstration work, I will refer more particularly to it. As the weevil has been in Texas for a number of years and we are able to study the statistics for this longer period, it will be interesting to know just what the facts there are.

The figures for a single plantation or a single county can not always be relied upon as furnishing an accurate index for general conclusions, but where the same cultural methods are introduced in a great number of different localities with practically unvarying results, we may safely base conclusions on these results. I shall print in the RECORD, as an appendix to my remarks (Appendix A), a list of farmers who have made experiments under the supervision of this division, planting 1 or 2 acres in their fields for that purpose, using the seed furnished and observing faithfully the cultural methods prescribed. There are 112 in all, taken from widely different communities, but all telling the same story of success. Nothing unreasonable is required of these farmers. There is not a more practical man in the United States than Doctor Knapp. He has simply adopted a system of cultivation that any farmer can readily follow with the implements he now uses on his farm. These farmers produced—in the very worst of the boll-weevil territory, mind you—from three-fourths to a bale and a half per acre. His agents visit the farmers and agree with them to furnish the seed for the experiment and to supervise the working of the crop, in this way carrying the practical lesson to the very men who need it most. In order to carry this work on successfully, it is necessary to have an agent for each county.

I agree with the chairman of the committee that it is not desirable that we pay all the expense of maintaining these experts. I believe a part of that burden should be borne by the counties or States, and in the district which I have the honor to represent we are doing our part. Some of the counties in Mississippi are paying half the expense of the expert and some even more than that. I have a most interesting and instructive statement, prepared by a number of prominent cotton growers in Harrison County, Tex., which I shall print as an appendix to my remarks (Appendix B), and which will be all the more interesting when we recall that Harrison County was one of the worst infested counties in the State; that the rainfall there is about 50 inches per annum; and that, according to a statement from the department, "nearly every farm is surrounded by timber." Here is the statement at length:

Harrison County, Tex., bordering on Louisiana, has a rainfall of about 50 inches per annum. Nearly every farm is surrounded by timber.

During the general alarm caused by the advent of the weevil, many farms were abandoned in 1907, and others diversified so that there was an enormous reduction in the crop, due in part to the weevil, but, as many believe, to a great extent to the reduction in acreage caused by the alarm.

In the spring of 1907 the farmers' cooperative demonstration work was introduced, but so late as not to have its full effect. Several hundred sample plots were distributed through the county. The effect of the work has been to restore confidence and, in a large measure, cotton production. The following letters from prominent citizens of that county will explain the situation.

The letters referred to are the ones I will append to my remarks when this speech appears in the RECORD. This letter is so pertinent that I will insert it right here in the body of my speech. Mr. Twyman is a merchant of Marshall, Tex., and knows whereof he speaks:

MARSHALL, TEX., January 26, 1909.

DR. S. A. KNAPP,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The people of Harrison County are very grateful for the work done by you during the last two years, for they feel it was indeed timely and saved many from bankruptcy. Many deserted their crops during 1907, but the presence of yourself, Mr. Proctor, and Mr. Plunkett kept up the courage of many, who, by their devotion to their crops during the boll-weevil scare, demonstrated to the rest of their countrymen that a crop could be made, even with the weevil present.

We believe that your work here prevented the depreciation of our lands in value and also kept our farmers from scattering over the world.

Marshall and Harrison counties are now on quite a boom.
Yours, respectfully,

W. T. TWYMAN.

I have a very interesting statement compiled from the figures of the Census Office showing the yield per annum from 1903 to 1908 of the entire State of Texas, from which it appears that the total crop has not been seriously diminished. Various reasons have been assigned for this which I will discuss briefly, but one fact does unquestionably stand out quite prominently and that is that cotton can be produced and produced at a profit even

with the boll weevil present and at work. Just how much cotton Texas would be producing if the weevil were not there is another question. I have heard the statement that you can prove anything by the census figures. Be that as it may, I have a table here showing the production in Louisiana and Texas for some years past, and I shall print that, too, as a part of my speech (Appendix C). The point I wish to emphasize is simply this, not that the boll weevil is not a most destructive pest, because it would be very stupid to say any such thing, but that it is not an accurate treatment of the figures to charge every slump in the yearly crop—as, for instance, in the crops of 1905 and 1907—to the ravages of the boll weevil. These same slumps came before the weevil invaded the United States. For instance:

Table showing difference between total production in bales of cotton in the years 1904 and 1905.

	Texas.	Louisiana.	Arkansas.	Mississippi.
1904.....	3,132,503	1,107,271	916,945	1,808,617
1905.....	2,490,128	523,871	615,837	1,198,508
Difference.....	642,375	583,400	301,608	610,049
Per cent loss.....	20+	52+	32+	33+

This table was prepared for me by the Department of Agriculture, with this explanatory note:

The foregoing table shows the great fluctuation in cotton production from one year to another, regardless of the presence of the boll weevil. Taking the years 1904 and 1905, the first was a good crop year in the State of Texas, Louisiana, Arkansas, and Mississippi, and the second was a poor crop year. The weevil had but just entered the border of Louisiana, but owing to conditions in the fall of 1904 and the winter of 1904 the effect of the weevil was scarcely to be taken into account in Louisiana in the periods mentioned.

The above table shows that the percentage of loss from the first to the second period in Texas, with the boll weevil over considerable of the State, was 20 per cent. In Louisiana, with the boll weevil over only a few counties and in those not disastrous at all, the loss was 52 per cent. In Arkansas, with no boll weevil, the loss was 32 per cent; and in Mississippi, with no boll weevil, the loss was 33 per cent.

I have another table to the same effect, which was also prepared for me by the department, which shows the yield per acre:

Showing the fluctuation in production of lint cotton per acre between two consecutive years in the State of Texas.

	Per cent.
Loss from 1870 to 1871.....	34
Loss from 1878 to 1879.....	36
Loss from 1880 to 1881.....	30
Loss from 1892 to 1893.....	48
Loss from 1894 to 1895.....	36
Loss from 1895 to 1896.....	31
Loss from 1906 to 1907.....	42

All of these figures are intended to show and only to show that it is not an accurate, but, on the contrary, a very erroneous conclusion to draw that the weevil is responsible for all the short crops.

The statement is made by some that in the eastern and central portions of Texas the cotton production has greatly declined, and that the reason the State has maintained its general average is due to extension of the industry into the western or drier portions of the State and into portions where the boll weevil has not yet appeared. This will not bear investigation. This table will prove interesting in this connection:

	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.*
East.....	651,651	889,452	460,100	898,973	473,945	788,323
Central.....	1,239,290	1,633,352	1,374,412	2,080,652	1,157,561	1,896,285
Semiwest.....	446,888	422,658	426,493	720,241	318,362	789,799
West.....	68,317	116,741	171,713	257,753	258,153	200,450
Total.....	2,406,149	3,062,203	2,432,718	3,957,619	2,208,021	3,671,857

* Estimated at 10 per cent above the census ginner's report of December 13, 1908, and leaving out 30,397 bales reported as scattering.

The official who prepared this table for me said in explanation:

I took a map of Texas and ran a line from north to south, covering the wooded portion and the portion of greatest rainfall in Texas, averaging from 40 to 50 inches per annum. I then drew a line west of the great central portion, or black prairie region, which has produced frequently more than one-half of the cotton crop of Texas. This also extends from north to south and has an average annual rainfall of from 30 to 40 inches. In the division west of this I included the counties that had produced no crop of any great extent, and this division covered such territory as has a range of about from 18 to 30 inches of rain per annum. All the territory west of this, with a rainfall of from 18 inches down to 10 inches, was included in the fourth section, which produced in 1903, 68,317 bales of cotton.

In general terms it may be stated that the wooded portions, nominally called "eastern Texas," generally produced about one-fourth of the cotton crop, the central portion about one-half,

the semiwest, or sometimes called "semiarid," about one-fourth, and the western portion but a small per cent of the production. These figures show that in the last five years, during which period the weevil extended over the entire area, there has been an increase of actual production in the central and eastern divisions amounting to several hundred thousand bales.

They show, further, that the cotton crop of 1906 is over 900,000 bales more than the crop of 1904, though much greater territory was covered by the weevil in 1906. This great increase is due mainly to greater production in the central and eastern portions of the State; and in the great increase of cotton in 1908 over 1907, amounting to over a million and a half bales, over a million are to be credited to the central and eastern portions.

Another very interesting fact appears from the figures which the department has furnished, and that is that the yield per acre has been greater during the last five years—that is, 1903 to 1908—than in the preceding five-year period, 1898 to 1903, the exact increase being an average of 7.4 pounds. From this it seems clear that the new territory planted in cotton beyond the area of boll-weevil infection is not responsible for the fact that the total yield of the State is about normal. Another interesting fact which throws much light on this phase of the situation is that the center of production for the State has not moved 10 miles in the last four years.

To summarize, we have reports from 112 individual farmers in Kaufman County, Tex., Webster and De Soto counties, in Louisiana (Appendix A), showing that good crops have been made in spite of the weevil.

The report of the committee of farmers of Harrison County, Tex. (Appendix B), giving successful results from 300 demonstration crops, certified to and indorsed by the county judge.

Report of the special agent of the Department of Agriculture at Marshall, Tex. (Appendix C.)

Census figures, which show the total crop in the boll-weevil sections of Texas to be as large as ever and the yield per acre to be equally as great.

In view of these facts, I feel warranted in giving an affirmative answer to the question, "Has cotton been successfully grown elsewhere under boll-weevil conditions?"

I will now direct my remarks to a discussion of the other inquiry, "Can this be done in the Yazoo Delta?"

We have all grown familiar with the prophecy that the weevil will find conditions just suited to his hand in the wet timbered delta, where all vegetation is so luxuriant in weed and foliage. The prophet of evil has pitched upon this much-favored section as the bright particular object of his maledictions. Not maliciously, of course, but none the less persistent, until even now, before the weevil has actually begun his work of destruction, panic stands upon the borders of the delta, threatening to invade us with results equally if not more calamitous than the ravages of the weevil have ever been.

If any prophecy can be indulged with assurance from the facts now known, it is quite certain that the weevil in a comparatively few years will have spread over the entire cotton producing area of the United States. How vain, then, and senseless any exodus from one section of the cotton belt to another in an effort to get away from the weevil. True, this has not hurt the delta so far, but if the planters there are to hold the labor, which they now have in some plenty, it will be necessary to convince the banker that these prophecies of evil are not well founded. If the planter can get no advances he can not supply his tenants, and if the tenant is thrown upon his own resources for the bread that is to keep body and soul together he must of necessity leave the farm and seek another field for his activities. All this can be prevented if we can reassure the timid, and the way to do that is to satisfy them that cotton can be grown in the delta at a profit after the weevil comes. To this end every county should at once join hands with Doctor Knapp and employ an expert to establish and superintend these demonstration farms just as has been done in Texas and Louisiana. His cultural methods are radically different from those now in vogue on most of the delta plantations, but they are simple, and experience has demonstrated their value. The sooner this is done the better, and I am glad to be able to say that a number of the counties are doing it now.

It would be money well spent if there was no such thing as the boll weevil. I shall print (Appendix D) a letter from a man who terms himself a "single-handed" farmer, which shows not only the character of the work that is being carried on by the department, but the good effect produced where it is most needed. This man will not be panic-stricken when the weevil reaches him.

Washington County has an expert who will give his entire time to that county, and now Coahoma has done likewise. Each county pays \$1,200 toward the salary of its expert and

the department here pays the balance. But to return to the question, Can cotton be successfully grown in the Yazoo Delta after the boll weevil comes? Until we have been through the fire we can not, of course, answer this question, as Texas has done, by pointing to the record of the thing actually done, but it is entirely competent to ask, If Texas has done it, why can not we? The first answer we always have to this inquiry is that, being a heavily timbered section, where the annual rainfall is very heavy, our situation discourages us to hope for success. That the delta is a heavily timbered section and that our rainfall is quite heavy can not be denied, but both of these untoward circumstances will bear investigation and analysis.

I have taken this excerpt from a statement furnished me in response to my request by the Department of Agriculture:

It is claimed by all experienced in handling the boll-weevil problems that an important factor is to have sunshine so as to destroy the larvae in the squares. The question of the ultimate rainfall in the course of the year is not so much a problem in cotton production as when that rainfall comes. It might come in the winter and make no particular difference, or if it comes in the summer the number of clear or sunshine days has a most important bearing. A light rainfall accompanied by cloudy weather would be practically as bad as a heavy rainfall followed by clear weather.

Accepting this statement as authoritative, and we must so accept it considering its source, it will be interesting to examine the reports of the Weather Bureau as shown in the following tables:

Annual precipitation.

	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Shreveport, La.	63.12	34.35	89.50	(*)
Greenville, Miss.	68.65	54.65	45.99	(*)
Dallas, Tex.	55.02	44.61	35.84	(*)
Yazoo City, Miss.	57.43	52.11	47.35	(*)

Precipitation, April to August, inclusive.

	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Shreveport, La.	36.94	18.98	18.86	26.63
Greenville, Miss.	34.91	17.40	11.31	26.03
Dallas, Tex.	29.73	28.03	16.63	21.82
Yazoo City, Miss.	24.71	19.35	24.17	31.52

Clear days, April to August, inclusive.

	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.
Shreveport, La.	67	72	84	60
Greenville, Miss.	71	96	92	81
Dallas, Tex.	73	60	74	56
Yazoo City, Miss.	84	92	91	85

* Not yet available.

From this table it will be observed that while the annual rainfall in the delta towns (which the department says "is not so much a problem") is heavier than Shreveport or Dallas, the number of sunshine days during the growing season (which the department says "is an important factor") is much larger.

Taking Dallas, Sulphur Springs, Paris, Rockland, Waco, and Wills Point as representing fairly the cotton area of Texas; Shreveport, Monroe, Simmsport, Alexandria, and Baton Rouge as representing fairly the cotton area of Louisiana; and taking Yazoo City, Greenville, and Greenwood for the Yazoo Delta, we find that the number of sunshine days during the crop-growing months of the past four years averages, for Texas 58.67, for Louisiana 76, and for the Yazoo Delta 80.08.

The rainfall is heavier to be sure, but the department says in the extract just referred to, "The question of the ultimate rainfall in the course of the year is not so much a problem in cotton production as when that rainfall comes." The number of sunshine days in the delta during the crop-growing months, as seen, is larger in the delta than in Texas or in Louisiana, and in the light of this fact it is pertinent to read again the statement of the department:

It is claimed by all experienced in handling the boll-weevil problems that an important factor is to have sunshine so as to destroy the larvae in the squares.

And now as to the other element of disadvantage which handicaps the delta planter—the fact that the delta is a heavily timbered section. By referring again to the table showing the crop of Texas by subdivisions for the past six years, we may be able to get some further light on this phase of the question. Bear in mind that the eastern division is the timbered section, where the rainfall is heaviest, averaging from 40 to 50 inches per annum. The central division is the black prairie region, with a yearly rainfall of from 30 to 40 inches. The semiwest (sometimes called the "semiarid") embraces those counties west of the great central belt, where the rainfall is from 18 to 30 inches; and the fourth division comprises all the State still farther west, the rainfall there being from 10 to 18 inches.

Total bales produced.

	1903.	1904.	1905.	1906.	1907.	1908.*
East.....	651,651	889,452	460,100	898,973	473,945	783,323
Central.....	1,239,290	1,633,352	1,374,412	2,080,652	1,157,561	1,896,285
Semiwest.....	446,888	422,658	426,493	720,241	318,362	783,799
West.....	68,817	116,741	171,713	257,753	258,153	290,450
Total.....	2,406,146	3,062,203	2,432,718	3,957,619	2,208,021	3,671,857

* Estimated at 10 per cent above the census ginners' report of December 13, 1908, and leaving out 30,397 bales reported as scattering.

A careful reading of these figures discloses the fact that, while there has been a very great fluctuation in the total crop from year to year, the variation in the timber section is no greater than in the prairie section. For instance, the decline in cotton production from 1906 to 1907 in the several sections enumerated was 47 per cent in the eastern division, 44 per cent in the central, 55 per cent in the semiwest, and there was a small increase in the west or arid, so that the entire decline was in the older portions of the cotton-producing counties, and the largest per cent decline was in the drier portion of the State. If the year 1907, which was a year of poor production and poor climatic conditions, be compared with 1905, another year of poor production, it will be noted that, while the total crop of 1907 was about 230,000 bales less than that of 1905, the eastern or timber division, the wetter portion of the State, shows a gain of over 13,000 bales, while in the semiarid portion there was a loss of over 100,000 bales, and in the prairie section the loss was more than 200,000 bales.

It may be considered very little consolation that the wet-land or timber-land farmer fares no worse than his neighbor in the prairie, since the figures show the falling off in one section of 44 per cent and in the other 47 per cent, which means practical ruin in either event. This is a very serious phase of the whole boll-weevil situation, because these figures are constantly paraded to show that all cotton planters are doomed to the demotion bow wows, whether the highland or the lowland goes first. But what about the crop in those States where there is no boll weevil? Take the counties in the Yazoo Delta, where there was no weevil, and we find that the crop in 1905 fell off from the crop of 1904 in Washington County 35 per cent; in Sunflower County, 40 per cent; in Quitman County, 43 per cent; and in the whole delta, 38 per cent; and in eastern division of Texas, 48 per cent. In other words, the falling off in the wet and timbered section of Texas, overrun by the weevil, was only 10 per cent greater than the falling off in the wet and timbered delta of Mississippi, without the weevil.

The following year, 1906, being a favorable crop season, both sections—that is, the timbered district of Texas and the delta counties of Mississippi—returned to their normal yield. Taking 1904, the high-water mark in cotton production, as a basis for comparison, we find that the weevil-infected district of Texas produced 9,521 bales more than 1904, while the delta counties of Mississippi made 38,295 bales less than 1904.

	1904.	1905.	1906.
East Texas division (timbered and wet).....	889,452	460,100	898,973
Yazoo Delta.....	413,738	255,819	345,443

In view of all these facts, which are beyond any question or refutation, I believe it is unreasonable and unwarranted to predict or believe that cotton can not be produced in the delta counties simply because they are in a heavily timbered region and the annual rainfall is heavy, or to expect the damage from the ravages of the weevil to be any greater there than elsewhere or to any extent more prolonged.

Convincing as these figures are to me that cotton can be produced at a profit in spite of the weevil, I would not accept them if their lesson had not been confirmed by statements from gentlemen whose experience in the very territory affected enables them to speak with knowledge. I began by saying that I was not certain which was the element of greatest disaster, the destruction of cotton or the panic which the weevil produces when he first enters a community. I believe I would be warranted in saying that the panic has done more than the bug. I have a communication from a gentleman who has had a number of years' experience in different sections of Louisiana and Texas which have been overrun by the weevil, and I quote from it to show that my opinion is shared by others who are in a position to know whereof they speak:

The greatest disaster that seems to come to a section is the fright. Our people make their cotton largely by means of advances from merchants and bankers. All the advances are withdrawn upon the advent of the weevil; consequently the farmer is obliged to discharge his em-

ployees and cut down his acreage enormously. In addition to this, many small farmers that receive advances abandon their farms and remove to other territory or go into other business. The large farmers diversify extensively—that is, put in other crops—because they have not the means to pay for cultivating such large areas in cotton. This immediately reduces the crop, and then the alarmist cries "Look and see what an immense decline has occurred, due to the weevil." When the labor has gone and the small farmers have abandoned their farms and the larger farmers have commenced to diversify, it takes some time to get back to a normal condition, and the surprise is that the State of Texas should show such a record of recovery. We think it is largely due to the government work that has been put in, because we concede that the boll weevil is a bad pest, and we admit that certain things must be done.

A different kind of cotton must be planted, a cotton of earlier maturity, different habits of growth and fruit production, in some cases different bolls. Then the method of cultivation must be changed, all of which requires time and requires that some one give it attention to prevent great disaster coming to the people. It is my opinion that the Department of Agriculture has the problem well in hand, and will be able to handle it provided we furnish the means sufficient to send men into the field and do the following things:

First. Stop the alarm and show the people that a crop can be made, regardless of the presence of the weevil.

Second. Point out the kind of cotton that should be raised under boll-weevil conditions and how to cultivate it so as to secure a crop.

I have another letter which I shall print in full. It is from the gentleman who has charge of this farm demonstration work, and who has had much experience in the campaign which has been waged against the boll weevil. I do not believe there is a man in the United States who is better qualified by training and experience to speak advisedly, and I commend his letter to the consideration of everyone who is earnestly seeking light on this most important subject. The letter is as follows:

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
BUREAU OF PLANT INDUSTRY,
Washington, D. C., February 1, 1909.

Hon. B. G. HUMPHREYS, M. C.,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: You have frequently asked me in regard to the ravages of the boll weevil.

I have been raising cotton in Louisiana on a more or less extensive scale for twenty-two years, and have been familiar with the history of cotton in the Southern States during that period. In January, 1904, I opened an office in Houston and commenced the demonstration work on a large scale. The greatest obstacles that I had to overcome in this effort to make a cotton crop were the following:

1. The general impression that under certain conditions the people could not make a crop.

2. The withdrawal of advances by bankers and merchants, causing disaster.

3. The people were obliged to change their general methods; that is, change their variety of cotton planted and produce their own food supplies upon their own farms. This requires time.

For instance, at that time it was asserted that while they could make a crop in the prairie section, in the eastern section, where the small farms are almost universally surrounded by woods, hibernating conditions would be so good that enough weevils would winter over to destroy the crop; and, furthermore, the timber section of east Texas has a much greater rainfall than the central or western prairies of that State. I have seen no counties more thoroughly demoralized by such reports than those along the line of the Houston and Texas Central Railway in central Texas; for examples, Limestone and other counties. In this section, upon reliable testimony, about one-half the farms had been abandoned and the acreage on the others greatly reduced, so that the crop fell in 1903 to a small per cent of what it was in former years. Almost our first work in 1904 was to furnish supplies of cotton seed and seeds for truck, melons, potatoes, and other products upon which the people could live. We were obliged to urge the merchants and banks to give some credit, or the whole civilization would have gone to pieces. Of course there were a good many doubters and some who refused to follow, but in the main people did their best, and as a result they found themselves in better condition in the fall of 1904 than they had been for years. Confidence was restored, and there has been a steady progress in that county ever since until the past year, 1908, when they produced one of the largest, if not the largest, crop of cotton ever produced in the history of that county.

The loss of confidence and the withdrawal of the loans by the banks and merchants, where the crop is almost universally made on the advance system, compelled larger farmers to put in about one-half the crop, while the smaller farmers and a large majority of the labor leave the country and go to sections where they can secure labor for the support of their families. This same story has been repeated as the weevil advanced eastward, all through eastern Texas, and it has required the greatest effort on our part to restore confidence and to bring the people back to believe that they can produce cotton with the boll weevil present. The effect of this fright is greater where there is more timber and sawmills and where the people can readily get other work. In Marshall County, on the eastern line of Texas, a normal crop of cotton was formerly over 20,000 bales. Notwithstanding our putting in a large number of sample farms, so that the people might be convinced that a cotton crop could be made, in 1907 the panic was so great that but a small acreage was planted, for the people believed that a crop of cotton could not be made. At the end of 1907 confidence was restored, because our demonstration plots showed that a crop could be made, and as a result, the people gradually returned to their farms, and those who had not abandoned their farms extended their cotton area until the crop of 1908 will approximate 20,000 bales, with a prospect of a much greater crop the ensuing year. Many letters in my possession indicate that the people have no fear of the weevil and are just as confident of making a crop under heavy rainfall and timbered conditions as before the weevil appeared.

The history of eastern Texas will be repeated so long as the people become panicky on the advent of the weevil. Certain things must be done—an earlier maturing and more prolific variety of cotton must be planted, and different methods of cultivation followed; but the main work is to keep the people from being panic-stricken, and induce them to do something to help themselves. It is not altogether, however, the people; the moneyed interest withdraws and the people are not es-

pecially to blame for not being able to put in as much cotton as they would under other circumstances. I feel confident that, with proper attention, your people in Mississippi need not fear the advent of the weevil.

Respectfully, yours,

S. A. KNAPP,
Special Agent in Charge.

APPENDIX A.

The following is a list of a few demonstrators and their yields in the vicinity of Terrell, Kaufman County, Tex., and is in the territory infested by the Mexican cotton boll weevil.

One thousand three hundred pounds of seed cotton of the varieties shown will make a 500-pound bale of lint cotton, whereas ordinary cotton requires about 1,500 pounds of lint to make a bale.

Cotton crop, 1908.

Name.	Address.	Variety.	Yield seed cotton per acre.
			Pounds.
W. Warren.....	Kaufman.....	Triumph.....	1,500
B. Warren.....	do.....	do.....	1,800
G. S. Phillips.....	do.....	do.....	1,500
A. C. Vall.....	Kemp.....	do.....	1,500
W. R. Lagow.....	Scurry.....	do.....	1,800
J. W. Duke.....	do.....	do.....	1,800
J. W. Stanfield.....	do.....	do.....	1,500
F. M. Stoy.....	Terrell.....	do.....	1,800
J. N. Stallings.....	do.....	do.....	2,200
O. P. Walton.....	do.....	do.....	2,200
H. P. Gaines.....	Elmo.....	do.....	1,600
D. T. Weddington.....	Terrell.....	do.....	1,800
J. R. Choate.....	Elmo.....	do.....	1,000
B. H. Conway.....	do.....	do.....	1,400
J. C. Lyon.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
Squire Peters.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
O. J. Ledbetter.....	Forney.....	do.....	1,400
A. S. Taylor.....	do.....	do.....	1,600
E. G. Dunsom.....	Kaufman.....	do.....	1,400
S. E. Greenslade.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
H. N. Hoffer.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
J. W. Bain.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
J. B. Haines.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
J. P. Spence.....	Kemp.....	do.....	1,200
W. C. Brooks.....	Terrell.....	do.....	1,000
W. Wickham.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
W. J. Wickham.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
J. D. McNell.....	Rosser.....	do.....	1,200
W. C. Roberson.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
E. C. Slayton.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
J. Stanfield.....	Scurry.....	do.....	1,500
J. H. Ewing.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
B. Williams.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
A. Peede.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
G. M. Chenouff.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
J. N. Buchanan.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
M. L. McCormick.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
J. F. Carter.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
W. P. Hightower.....	Terrell.....	do.....	1,000
J. P. Springer.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
F. K. McGinnis.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
B. Holland.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
E. P. Piper.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
B. T. Pullin.....	do.....	do.....	1,500
H. Pullin.....	do.....	do.....	1,500
A. H. Beavers.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
O. H. Bodin.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
A. Huff.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
J. S. Grinnan.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
W. H. Lyon.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
J. H. Grannt.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
C. W. Durham.....	do.....	do.....	1,400
E. Langmity.....	do.....	do.....	1,400

The following is a list of a few demonstrators and their yields, in the vicinity of Minden, Webster County, La., and is in the territory infested by the Mexican cotton-boll weevil.

One thousand three hundred pounds of seed cotton of the variety shown will make a 500-pound bale of lint cotton, whereas ordinary cotton requires about 1,500 pounds of lint to make a bale.

Name.	Address.	Variety.	Yield seed cotton per acre.
			Pounds.
J. W. Hortman.....	Hortman.....	Triumph.....	1,800
W. J. Word.....	Minden.....	do.....	1,600
Hugh McDaniel.....	Shongaloo.....	do.....	1,400
J. E. Sexton.....	Jefferson.....	do.....	1,100
J. B. Lee.....	Leton.....	do.....	1,130
S. L. Cole.....	Cotton Valley.....	do.....	1,500
L. L. Houston.....	Sarepta.....	do.....	1,000
J. C. Fulbright.....	Minden.....	do.....	1,300
F. Youngblood.....	do.....	do.....	1,130
W. Alexander.....	Yellow Pine.....	do.....	1,100
D. W. Pratt.....	Minden.....	do.....	1,000
W. M. Canfield.....	Oglvie.....	do.....	1,000
A. P. Lipscomb.....	Minden.....	do.....	1,000
J. B. Fields.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
W. A. Barrett.....	Grove.....	do.....	1,000
F. M. Sexton.....	Minden.....	do.....	1,100
J. S. Turner.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
W. H. Hortman.....	Heflin.....	do.....	1,000

The following is a list of a few demonstrators and their yields in the vicinity of Grand Cane, De Soto County, La., and is in the territory infested by the Mexican cotton boll weevil.

One thousand three hundred pounds of seed cotton of the varieties shown will make a 500-pound bale of lint cotton; whereas ordinary cotton requires about 1,500 pounds of lint to make a bale.

Name.	Address.	Variety.	Yield seed cotton per acre.
R. H. Anthony.....	Cook.....	Triumph.....	Pounds. 1,334
C. M. Rassoe.....	Hatcher.....	do.....	1,000
H. T. Copeland.....	Benson.....	do.....	1,250
Walter Noland.....	do.....	do.....	1,300
W. L. Worsham.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
G. W. Tull.....	Grand Cane.....	do.....	1,000
Mrs. S. E. McMicall.....	do.....	Cook.....	1,150
Mrs. I. V. Cowdin.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
B. W. Cowdin.....	do.....	Triumph.....	1,300
O. E. Milby.....	do.....	do.....	1,300
L. H. Richardson.....	do.....	do.....	1,300
W. S. Phillips.....	do.....	do.....	1,100
W. E. McMicall.....	do.....	Rowdan.....	1,500
J. B. Abington.....	do.....	Triumph.....	1,000
David Johnson.....	do.....	do.....	1,467
J. C. Sturgis.....	do.....	Rowdan.....	1,200
G. C. Dixons.....	do.....	Triumph.....	1,040
W. E. Stong.....	do.....	Bank Account.....	1,250
J. F. Fisher.....	do.....	Triumph.....	1,450
W. S. Powell.....	Stonewall.....	do.....	1,325
E. H. Powell.....	do.....	do.....	1,375
J. M. Nelson.....	do.....	do.....	1,125
J. A. Williamson.....	do.....	do.....	1,160
Henry Marshall.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
J. J. and W. A. Louy.....	Gloster.....	do.....	1,250
J. H. Sample.....	Longstreet.....	do.....	1,134
M. Rowe.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
H. W. Dixon.....	do.....	do.....	1,050
Wm. Bigham.....	Mansfield.....	do.....	1,000
Eugene Milford.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
L. A. Lowery.....	do.....	Bank Account.....	1,200
J. T. Guy.....	do.....	Triumph.....	1,200
T. H. Risher.....	Pelican.....	do.....	1,114
W. E. Risher.....	do.....	do.....	1,123
W. D. Coday.....	Logansport.....	do.....	1,250
W. C. Arsett.....	do.....	do.....	1,200
W. C. Clark.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
L. B. Adams.....	do.....	do.....	1,400
E. C. Ashton.....	do.....	do.....	1,000
E. P. Sims.....	do.....	do.....	1,450
Royal Dennis.....	do.....	do.....	1,200

APPENDIX B.

MARSHALL, TEX., October 10, 1907.

Dr. S. A. KNAPP,

Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work,
Lake Charles, La.

DEAR SIR: We, the undersigned committee for Harrison County, Tex., make the following preliminary report on the farmers' cooperative demonstration work done the past season in this county.

On account of the ravages of the boll weevil, Harrison County, Tex., was threatened with a disaster in the loss of the cotton crop that would affect every material interest in the county. The loss of money was not the sole consideration; our tenants and farm laborers would, to a large degree, leave the county, and would thus permanently injure our Commonwealth. In this emergency we appealed to the United States Department of Agriculture through you for advice and aid; you came to our county and organized the work in February, 1907, under an arrangement by which the Department of Agriculture would furnish the superintendents and the people of this county would raise enough funds to buy improved seed for the demonstration farms. The citizens of the county promptly raised and deposited in bank \$1,000 and later contributed \$700 more, making a total of \$1,700 invested in better seed. All agreements between the Department of Agriculture and the people were promptly and satisfactorily carried out. Almost without exception this was the worst season this section has ever known for producing cotton, but, without reservation, we wish to make the following statements:

First. The results of the demonstration work have been in the highest degree satisfactory to our people, and they regard this movement as one of the greatest ever made for the upbuilding of our section.

Second. Our people are unanimous in asking for its continuance, and would regard the discontinuance of the work as an untold disaster.

Third. Among the many good things accomplished, we enumerate the following:

(a) It established over 300 demonstration farms, scattered over the entire county.

(b) It taught better culture and introduced better seed. These two items alone were worth more than \$100,000 this year to our county in actual cash, to say nothing of future benefits. The improvement was so apparent that the observing traveler on the highways could pick out every demonstration field.

(c) This demonstration work saved a stampede of tenant farmers and laborers from the farm.

(d) It gave confidence to the merchants and bankers that a crop would be made, and thus promoted credit.

(e) It demonstrated to the farmers that a crop of cotton could be made under extremely adverse condition of weather and insect pests, and they enter another year with perfect confidence.

Great credit for the success of this year's work is due to the excellent supervision of W. F. Procter, state agent for Texas, and to the untiring energy of T. O. Plunkett, local agent.

JNO. H. POPE.
W. T. TWYMAN.
P. G. WHALEY.
M. SCULLY.
H. B. MCWILLIAMS.
W. L. MARTIN.

The committeemen are well known to me and are among the most substantial and reliable citizens of Harrison County, Tex., and I also personally indorse the statements made.

H. S. LITTLETON,
County Judge, Harrison County, Tex.
MARSHALL, TEX., January 27, 1908.

Dr. S. A. KNAPP, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The year 1907 was a great factor for the cooperative demonstration work, for the fact that it demonstrated beyond a doubt that cotton could be made in a district where boll weevils were as bad as they were ever known anywhere. Our people became easy in their minds about the boll weevil, and there was not a farmer in Harrison County afraid to plant cotton in 1908. The year 1908 was one of unprecedented rainfalls and great floods, which ruined many fields of corn and cotton, and boll weevils were almost as numerous as they were in 1907. With an increased acreage of probably one-third over 1907, more than 17,000 bales of cotton of the 1908 crop have been produced according to the last ginners' report. It is estimated that the yield of cotton in Harrison County for 1908 will reach 20,000 bales.

In 1907 R. R. Scott, of Scottsville, a large planter who furnished his tenants, did not believe we could make cotton and fight the boll weevil. He called in all the men he could from his farms and had them cut cross-ties to pay for the provisions already furnished. The same thing was done by J. M. Furrh, at Elysian Fields, who is about the largest planter in Harrison County. These men and others who took the same course are working with us now, and they never mention the boll weevil with any fear.

The price of lands in Harrison County in the spring of 1907 was at the lowest ebb, ranging from \$4 to \$20 per acre. Since the successful fight against the boll weevil and the general advancement in agricultural work, lands have advanced from 100 to 500 per cent.

TOM O. PLUNKETT,
Special Agent, Farmers' Cooperative Demonstration Work.

APPENDIX C.

Actual production of cotton in Texas and Louisiana.

[From Census Reports.]

	Texas.	Louisiana.
	Bales.	Bales.
1908 *	3,705,761	510,752
1907.....	2,267,293	679,782
1906.....	4,066,472	979,270
1905.....	2,490,128	523,871
1904.....	3,132,503	1,107,271
1903.....	2,454,616	836,334
1902.....	2,475,881	886,365
1901.....	2,491,394	852,448
1900.....	3,368,310	720,088
1899.....	2,556,413	713,929
1898.....	3,363,109	717,747
1897.....	2,822,408	788,325
1896.....	2,122,701	567,251
1895.....	1,905,337	513,843
1894.....	3,140,392	760,757
1893.....	1,997,000	473,000

* Based on Census Bureau Ginners' Report of December 13, 1908, adding the usual percentage of crop not reported.

Production of cotton.

[From Bureau of Statistics.]

TEXAS.	Bales.
1878.....	1,105,133
1879.....	752,500
1880.....	1,224,162
1882.....	1,326,000
1883.....	1,118,000
1884.....	995,400
1885.....	1,332,027
1886.....	1,499,698
1887.....	1,584,131
1888.....	1,594,305
1889.....	1,471,242
LOUISIANA.	Bales.
1878.....	476,629
1879.....	593,431
1880.....	359,147
1882.....	560,000
1883.....	490,200
1884.....	485,200
1885.....	487,722
1886.....	471,974
1887.....	504,622
1888.....	446,778
1889.....	659,180

APPENDIX D.

BERRY, ALA., October 5, 1908.

Mr. S. A. KNAPP.

SIR: I have thought that I would rite you for some time, but for neglect have waited to long. I am one of your demonstrators and as true a one as you have. Words can not express my thanks to you for your help and what you have learned me about farming. This year I had 1 acre, this coming year I ame to put my entire crop in as I did that acre. I am a singlehanded man, no help and renting land. Some say they don't see how I make a living, just me to work and feed two big mules. I tell them that the mules feed themselves and if I make the landowner any money I will make some for me. I think by having an early start that I can get in 8 acres this time, 3 in cotton and 5 in corn. I think I will get 3,000 lbs. of cotton off my acre if it all opens. The seed you furnished me is the finest that

I ever saw, me and two other men picked 100 bolls that Triumph cotton in my acre that weighed 3½ lbs. That beat anything I ever saw. The Triumph cotton has been gined here and found to beat 40 per cent. That is far ahead of anything we have had here before. Anything you will send me will be more than appreciated. When I get any mail from you I don't stop till I read it thro'. The farmers are coming more together with your work than anything that ever came along. I think in a few years the farmers will be rite along together. Don't forget me, anything you can due for me I will be glad to get it. The knights are giting long and I would like to read something from you every night.

I will close. Hope you have not wearied over this hard wrote letter. I am your friend,

J. A. KELLER, Berry, Ala.

APPENDIX E.

Extract from a letter of Col. Charles Schuler, commissioner of agriculture, addressed to the farmers of Louisiana December 19, 1908, and published in the Shreveport Times, in which the writer takes strong grounds in the paper of the possibility of raising cotton under boll-weevil conditions. Among other things, he said:

EXAMPLE OF DE SOTO.

In my own parish of De Soto diversified farming has proven a marked success. Prosperity is returning to both the farmer and merchant, and this can be credited to nothing more than making the farm self-sustaining and to adopting the up-to-date methods of fertilization and cultivation. Two farmers particularly in De Soto Parish may be pointed to as a very successful in the fight against the weevil. Mr. D. J. Bland, of Logansport, and Mr. A. R. Roach, of Mansfield. The former gentleman has averaged 1,000 pounds and over of seed cotton per acre for the past three years, farming on relatively poor, up-land soil.

Mr. Roach, at Mansfield, has done equally as well on his upland soil, and has made this year nearly a bale to the acre on bottom land. Mr. Roach frankly says that he has averaged more cotton per acre during the past four years fighting the weevil than he did during the fourteen years preceding 1904 farming on the same land.

Success in fighting the weevil is by no means confined to hill farmers. E. N. Norris, of Grand Bayou, and J. M. Robinson, of Bayou Le Chute, both farming in Red River Valley, made good crops last year.

Even at Bunkie, where the weevils were worse this year than anywhere in the State, R. F. Keary made over 600 pounds of seed cotton to the acre in spite of the weevils and bad weather. It is true that some of his neighbors failed to make a crop, but they did not follow the improved methods advocated by the crop-pest commission and the Department of Agriculture. Porter Fisher, farming at Keachie, after five years' experience with the weevil, says:

"I am just now finding out how to make cotton. You have got to clean up your fields in the fall, plant early varieties, fertilize heavily, and cultivate for all you are worth."

Mr. Fisher this year made 8 bales to the mule on hill land.

OTHERS MAY DO AS WELL.

What these men and others have done can be done by any intelligent farmer who attends to his business as he should. The more vigorous colored people can do the same thing with proper instruction and encouragement.

Some people hold to the opinion that the negro can not be induced to adopt better methods of cultivation or to diversify successfully, but my own experience with the colored men on my own place at Keachie has been such that I have great hopes for the future of our colored farmers if they be but rightly instructed and encouraged by their white brethren. In February, 1907, I received information from De Soto Parish that there was an exodus of negro laborers from that part of the parish known as "Africa." The laborers were going to Oklahoma, and I was requested to go up and visit that section to see if I could do something to stop it. I went and held a meeting of the heads of negro families at the negro church for a plain, practical, business talk. On a Saturday I met 96 negro men there, and I talked to them for an hour and a half on diversification, more industrious habits, buying less on credit, and explaining to them that the South was the country for them to live in; that they were among friends, etc. I promised them that demonstration farms would be established in their midst and an occasional lecture given to teach them. I wired Doctor Knapp, of the United States Demonstration Farm Work, and had established in the parish of De Soto 240 demonstration farms of from 3 to 5 acres each, with a lecturer to visit these farms as often as it was possible for them to do so.

WAS PERSONALLY INTERESTED.

I was personally interested in that section, having 800 acres of land there being worked on the tenant system. I had one demonstration farm established on my place under the control of a negro, who owed me \$623. I went to Europe in the interest of immigration and did not return to my plantation or parish until the following November. My experience with my tenants was as follows: The negro who owed me \$623 paid me every cent of it; had three bales of cotton left over, and had plenty of corn and meat to do him for that year. I supplied him for the year 1908, and his indebtedness at the end of the season was only \$32. He has 11 bales of cotton and again had plenty of corn and meat to do him. Another negro owed me over \$300 for the year 1907. He paid it all; paid me \$80 cash for a mule, had some money left over, and had plenty of corn and meat to do him. One negro who had been working for me sixteen years, and who had never been out of debt before, came out of debt and had some money left over, besides a plentiful supply of corn and good meat. The fact is, every one of my tenants paid up for the year 1907, and I attribute the success of my tenants and neighboring negroes in the improvement of the 1908 crop to, first, the talk I gave them, and secondly, to the establishment of the demonstration farms in their midst. It stopped the exodus of negro laborers, and a number are now in a prosperous condition.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For investigating the methods of growing, harvesting, packing, storing, handling, and shipping fruits, and for experimental shipments of fruits within the United States and to foreign countries, \$71,360.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I want to offer an amendment, to insert after the word "fruits," on lines 2 and 3, page 18, the words "and melons."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 18, lines 2 and 3, after the word "fruits," insert the words "and melons."

Mr. SCOTT. I accept that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Mr. Chairman, I would like to hear it read as amended.

The Clerk read the paragraph as amended.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

Purchase and distribution of valuable seeds: For the purchase, propagation, testing, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants; all necessary office fixtures and supplies, fuel, transportation, paper, twine, gum, postal cards, gas, and electric current, official traveling expenses, and all necessary material and repairs for putting up and distributing the same; for rent and repairs and the employment of local and special agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required, in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$317,960, of which amount not less than \$270,320 shall be allotted for congressional distribution. And the Secretary of Agriculture is hereby directed to expend the said sum, as nearly as practicable, in the purchase, testing, and distribution of such valuable seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, the best he can obtain at public or private sale, and such as shall be suitable for the respective localities to which the same are to be apportioned, and in which same are to be distributed as herein-after stated, and such seeds so purchased shall include a variety of vegetable and flower seeds suitable for planting and culture in the various sections of the United States. An equal proportion of five-sixths of all seeds, bulbs, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants, shall, upon their request, after due notification by the Secretary of Agriculture that the allotment to their respective districts is ready for distribution, be supplied to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates to Congress for distribution among their constituents, or mailed by the department upon the receipt of their addressed franks, in packages of such weight as the Secretary of Agriculture and the Postmaster-General may jointly determine: *Provided, however*, That upon each envelope or wrapper containing packages of seeds the contents thereof shall be plainly indicated, and the Secretary shall not distribute to any Senator, Representative, or Delegate seeds entirely unfit for the climate and locality he represents, but shall distribute the same so that each Member may have seeds of equal value, as near as may be, and the best adapted to the locality he represents: *Provided also*, That the seeds allotted to Senators and Representatives for distribution in the districts embraced within the twenty-fifth and thirty-fourth parallels of latitude shall be ready for delivery not later than the 10th day of January: *Provided also*, That any portion of the allotments to Senators, Representatives, and Delegates in Congress remaining uncalled for on the 1st day of April shall be distributed by the Secretary of Agriculture, giving preference to those persons whose names and addresses have been furnished by Senators and Representatives in Congress, and who have not before during the same season been supplied by the department: *And provided also*, That the Secretary shall report, as provided in this act, the place, quantity, and price of seeds purchased, and the date of purchase; but nothing in this paragraph shall be construed to prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from sending seeds to those who apply for the same. And the amount herein appropriated shall not be diverted or used for any other purpose but for the purchase, testing, propagation, and distribution of valuable seeds, bulbs, mulberry and other rare and valuable trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants: *Provided further*, That \$45,640 of which sum, or so much thereof as the Secretary of Agriculture shall direct, may be used to collect, purchase, test, propagate, and distribute rare and valuable seeds, bulbs, trees, shrubs, vines, cuttings, and plants from foreign countries or from our possessions for experiments with reference to their introduction into and cultivation in this country, and same shall not be distributed generally, but shall be used for experimental tests, to be carried on with the cooperation of the agricultural experiment stations.

Total for Bureau of Plant Industry, \$1,620,736.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Insert in line 16, page 19, after the word "seventy," the word "two," so as to read "\$72,320."

Mr. SCOTT. The purpose of the amendment, Mr. Chairman, is merely to correct a typographical error.

The question was taken, and the amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

General expenses, Forest Service: To enable the Secretary of Agriculture to experiment and to make and continue investigations and report on forestry, national forests, forest fires, and lumbering, but no part of this appropriation shall be used for any experiment or test made outside the jurisdiction of the United States; to advise the owners of woodlands as to the proper care of the same; to investigate and test American timber and timber trees and their uses, and methods for the preservative treatment of timber; to seek, through investigations and the planting of native and foreign species, suitable trees for the treeless regions; to erect necessary buildings: *Provided*, That the cost of any building erected shall not exceed \$500; to pay all expenses necessary to protect, administer, and improve the national forests; to ascertain the natural conditions upon and utilize the national forests; and the Secretary of Agriculture may, in his discretion, permit timber and other forest products cut or removed from the national forests, except the Black Hills National Forest in South Dakota, to be exported from the State, Territory, or the district of Alaska in which said forests are respectively situated: *Provided*, That the exportation of dead and insect-infested timber only from said Black Hills National Forest shall be allowed until such time as the Forester shall certify that the ravages of the destructive insects in said forests are practically checked, but in no case after July 1, 1910; to transport and care for fish and game supplied to stock the national forests or the waters therein; to employ fiscal and other agents, clerks, assistants, and other labor required in practical forestry and in the administration of national forests, in the city of Washington and elsewhere; to collate, digest, report, and

illustrate the results of experiments and investigations made by the Forest Service; to purchase law books to an amount not exceeding \$500, necessary supplies, apparatus, and office fixtures, and technical books and technical journals for officers of the Forest Service stationed outside of Washington; to pay freight, express, telephone, and telegraph charges; for electric light and power, fuel, gas, ice, washing towels, and official traveling and other necessary expenses; and for rent in the city of Washington and elsewhere, \$3,986,000: *Provided*, That no part of the money herein appropriated shall be used to pay the transportation or traveling expenses of any forest officer or agent except he be traveling on business directly connected with the Forest Service and in furtherance of the works, aims, and objects specified and authorized in and by this appropriation: *Provided further*, That no part of this appropriation shall be paid or used for the purpose of paying for in whole or in part the preparation or publication of any newspaper or magazine article, but this shall not prevent the giving out to all persons without discrimination, including newspaper and magazine writers and publishers, of any facts or official information of value to the public.

Mr. MONDELL and Mr. MARTIN rose.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair recognizes the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. MARTIN. Mr. Chairman, I would like to inquire of the chairman of the committee whether, in his judgment, there is any good reason why this large lump-sum appropriation of nearly \$4,000,000, in this paragraph, should not hereafter be classified and apportioned separately as in other appropriation bills?

Mr. SCOTT. I hope there is no reason why it should not hereafter be classified and itemized more closely. It seemed, however, to the committee that it would be impracticable to do it in this bill, for the following reasons: This year there has been a very marked change in the organization of the bureau, by means of which the national forests have been divided into districts and headquarters have been established for each of those districts in the field, so that a very large amount of the work that hitherto has been done in Washington is now done in the headquarters of the various districts.

Mr. MARTIN. Does the gentleman think that if the appropriations for this bureau had been made after the usual method of apportioning the amounts the large number of separate heads of the bureau through different portions of the West would probably have been established at all?

Mr. SCOTT. I have no reason to doubt that the chief of the bureau would have been of the same opinion that he is now, that greater efficiency could be reached through the organization which he has adopted.

Mr. MARTIN. In the manner that the committee has recommended these appropriations is there anything except the opinion of the chief of the bureau to govern how he shall use this fund?

Mr. SCOTT. There is nothing. The question of more closely itemizing this large fund was discussed at length by the committee, and the chief of the bureau was asked to submit an estimate in a different form.

He did this, saying that it was the very best he felt he could do without running great risk of hampering the service, by submitting an estimate, in which he divided the appropriation among the various districts, giving in a lump sum the amount he expected to expend in each of the districts. That did not seem to the committee to be getting any nearer the result it desired than the original proposition. The Forester gave to the committee his assurance, however, that after this new system had been in operation for a year he would be able to, and he would, send an estimate, itemized as the committee desired. He thought it was impossible, however, for him to do it now, because the new system has not been tried long enough to enable him to make a reasonable guess as to the manner in which the funds should be assigned.

Mr. MARTIN. Is it the purpose of the committee to hereafter systematize the appropriations for this bureau as all others under the service?

Mr. SCOTT. It is the decided purpose of the committee to do it.

Mr. MARTIN. I should like to call the gentleman's attention to the following section, and inquire whether the purposes there enumerated for which this \$600,000 additional is added to this general sum are not all subjects that can be covered by the authorizations already given in the previous section. I notice, for example, in the last section: "Erecting necessary buildings;" and further, "to improve the national forests;" and I notice in the following section the general clause "to erect cabins and fences and other permanent improvements, \$600,000." Does not that mean to accumulate \$600,000 for purposes already covered by the general section?

Mr. SCOTT. Not in the opinion of the committee, and not according to the construction of the bureau. The appropriation for permanent improvements has been carried, I think, for the last three years—the sum fixed the first year being \$500,000;

last year, \$600,000; and for the coming year, as provided in this bill, the same amount; and it has been the construction of the Forester that he is limited in the work of permanent improvements to the amount provided by this paragraph.

Mr. MARTIN. Well, for example, I notice for "necessary buildings" in the main paragraph, and the buildings shall not exceed \$500 each. The following paragraph provides \$600,000 for general improvements. Certainly that whole \$600,000, without any limitation, can be expended in making buildings to cost not exceeding \$500 each, can it not?

Mr. SCOTT. I think so.

Mr. MARTIN. In other words, it means an added, accumulated appropriation. It can be used for at least some of the purposes already covered by the appropriation of \$3,900,000.

Mr. SCOTT. The committee concedes without any cavil the various suggestions the gentleman is making touching the desirability of greater itemization in this appropriation, and if it had seemed possible to secure such an arrangement it would have been done.

Mr. MARTIN. If I have any further time I desire to say that while from the beginning I have been, and still am, enthusiastic for the conservation policy of the Government, particularly as far as it pertains to the proper preservation and utilization of the forests, that the sentiment throughout the West with reference to the way this service is being applied is growing more and more adverse to it.

It is becoming very difficult for the settler; the man who is honestly looking to a particular spot to make his home, containing the proper area where he can settle, is almost sure to find that the ranger desires to select this particular piece as the site of a government cabin. The settlers in a given locality render a great deal of service in the conservation of the forests, for the reason that they are interested in putting out fires on the range. I think it is an extraordinary expenditure of money, without any stipulation as to what manner and for what purposes it is to be used, and the tendency of it frequently is rather to subvert than promote the interests of these great forests, in which we of the West take a lively interest. For one I would like to suggest to the committee the propriety of bringing this bureau as rapidly as possible to that proper administration that applies to the other branches of the public service.

Mr. PARSONS. I understood the gentleman to say that the settlers could render services equal to those of the ranger. Will the gentleman explain that?

Mr. MARTIN. I think my statement will be found not to go to that extent. It is well known to people familiar with the forests, that the settlers in that section are interested as individuals in the preservation of the forests and the prosperity of that locality, and will readily cooperate with the Bureau of Forestry in its efforts to prevent and extinguish fires. They are anxious to promote the well-being of the locality and in a proper and legitimate way to help this service in protecting any of our natural resources.

Mr. MONDELL. I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 24, line 7, strike out "nine" and insert "four."

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, the amendment I propose reduces the lump sum appropriated for the Forestry Service in the sum of \$500,000. The committee increased the very liberal appropriation of last year—

Mr. PARSONS. I would like to reserve the point of order against that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is too late.

Mr. PARSONS. I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MONDELL. The amendment is not subject to the point of order. As I said, the amendment reduces the lump-sum appropriation by \$500,000. The committee has increased the very liberal appropriation—I may say the very extravagant appropriation—carried in the bill last year by \$750,000.

In the report of the committee the statement is made that that increase is necessitated by the increased acreage within the reserve, it being stated that 17,000,000 acres have been added to the reserves since last year. Now, the bureau insists that it expends about 9 mills per acre for the administration and care of the reserves; but assuming that 1 cent per acre is to be expended in this way, this additional area would call for an additional appropriation of \$170,000, rather than \$750,000. However, the very liberal appropriation of last year, taken altogether, amounts to about 2½ cents per acre. On that basis this increase should be not \$750,000, but about \$450,000. However, the bureau, in its report—and, I think, the Forester in his statement before the committee—called attention to the well-known fact that territory newly included in reserves is not, during the

first year or so, very closely patrolled or as fully and expensively administered as later.

Therefore, assuming that this appropriation ought to be increased at all (and in my opinion it should be decreased a very great deal, in the interest of the purposes for which the reserves were established), it certainly ought not to be increased over \$250,000. Therefore I have presented my amendment.

On yesterday I gave some facts and figures with regard to the extravagant expenditures of this service. I called attention to the fact that, without any specific authority so to do, the service had established six departments or field divisions last year, and, according to the estimates for the coming fiscal year for the maintenance of the headquarters of these six divisions, the cost will amount to \$835,360 for purely clerical services, clerks, and assistants connected with these division headquarters. The incurrence of this vastly increased appropriation does not bring about any corresponding decrease in the appropriation in Washington; for while the amount estimated for the Washington office last year was \$571,000, the amount asked for the Washington office this year is \$490,000. So that there is an increase in the field for purely clerical services of over \$800,000, and a decrease in Washington of about \$80,000; so that in this one bureau, supposed to be established for the protection of the forests and the conservation of the water supplies, the increased cost in one year for purely clerical work is \$754,300. As a matter of fact that is what this increased appropriation is needed for.

Now I think that the expenditures of the Forestry Bureau have been quite extravagant enough in the past. The bureau pays from its lump-sum appropriation more high salaries in proportion to the number of its employees than any bureau of the Government. It is notorious in the region in which these reserves are located that high-priced men in great numbers are constantly going over the reserves to investigate this, that, and the other condition, or alleged condition; that a large portion of the time of these scientific gentlemen is consumed in attending meetings and in furthering the very elaborate propaganda of this bureau, carried on for the purpose of strengthening its hold among people who are acquainted with the character of the work which it is actually performing.

Now, Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that we went quite far enough last year in increasing the appropriation, and in adding to the lump-sum appropriation \$600,000 for permanent improvements, and that we shall be treating the bureau not only fairly but liberally if we give them an increase, not of \$750,000, but \$250,000.

Mr. PARSONS. Does the gentleman contend that the administrative districts that were established are against efficiency, or in the direction of efficiency?

Mr. MONDELL. In my remarks yesterday I said I did not pretend to pass on that question. I am inclined to think that it might be well for the Forestry Service to do as the Land Office does, establish administrative districts, with modest and reasonable headquarters, costing three or four thousand dollars a year each to maintain, through which certain reports may be transmitted to the central office at Washington, and where certain questions may be settled without reference to the Washington office.

I am not certain as to that, but when the bureau establishes six districts, that cost all the way from \$144,000 to \$147,000 each per annum for clerical services alone, we are not surprised that they are asking for \$35,000 worth of typewriters for the coming fiscal year to keep this force busy.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman yield for another question?

Mr. MONDELL. I will.

Mr. PARSONS. Is not it necessary in establishing the administrative districts to send the records to those districts and keep the records there?

Mr. MONDELL. If the gentleman wants to know the opinion of the gentleman from Wyoming on that subject, I will be frank about it. My opinion is this: These expensive administrative districts were largely established for the purpose of stemming the tide of popular opposition to certain policies of the department in the region in which it operates. That is my opinion.

Mr. PARSONS. Will the gentleman answer the question whether it is not necessary to send out there to each administrative districts these records?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think of any special records that would be needed. The maps of the reserves are printed in duplicate. It would not be expensive to send those out there. The gentleman recalls that in the matter of land titles the Agricultural Department must yield to the Interior Department, and

therefore the questions relating to patents and to rights of way in the nature of easements must be referred to the Interior Department, and all land plats are in the Interior Department and not in the Agricultural Department.

Mr. PARSONS. What are the records that the Bureau of Forestry keeps?

Mr. MONDELL. I am not fully informed on that subject. I presume they have some records.

Mr. PARSONS. They have records in regard to permits?

Mr. MONDELL. I do not think it would cost \$147,000 to send the records to Missoula, and it ought not to cost that amount to keep the men to look after them.

Mr. PARSONS. How many permits are granted in the Missoula district a year?

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, a few thousand; and the gentleman from New York, if he was running the reserves, could issue all the permits that are issued all over the United States and he would not be near as busy as he is now. [Laughter.]

Mr. PARSONS. I want to say that I visited a forest reserve in the gentleman's State, and I was very much impressed with the work they were doing.

Mr. MONDELL. Oh, they do some good work. Spending the money they do, it would be strange if they did not.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, inasmuch as this matter has been very thoroughly discussed, I ask unanimous consent that all debate close on this amendment in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent that all debate on the amendment close in five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it is true, as the gentleman from Wyoming has suggested, that one reason given for the increase in the appropriation for the forest reserves allowed in this bill is the extension of the area of the forests, but that is not the only reason. Additional reasons, and very strong ones, are found in the tremendous increase in the use of the forests. As I stated in my opening address yesterday:

The books of the Forest Service show that last year the number of timber sales increased 206 per cent, the amount of timber cut 102 per cent, free-use permits 176 per cent, and the number of special permits 67 per cent, while the sales and fees received increased 20 per cent. Summing it all up, the total increase in the amount of business done was 46 per cent.

Obviously a very large increase in the use of the forests demands an increase in the forest force, and an increase in the forest force calls for an increase in the appropriation to pay that force, just as an increase in the business of a merchant, in the number of customers coming into his store, calls for an addition to the number of clerks.

But not only has the use of the forests increased, but it is hoped through this new arrangement to facilitate the transaction of business for the benefit of those who use them.

If I mistake not, one of the complaints of the gentleman from Wyoming, as voiced in this Chamber heretofore, has been the tedious delay in the transaction of business brought before the Forestry Service. One of the first purposes sought to be gained by the new system, whereby the forests are divided into districts and headquarters are established in the field, is to facilitate the transaction of business so that hereafter there will be no occasion for such complaint.

I can not acquiesce in the statement that the bureau is administered with wanton and reckless extravagance. It was found by the Keep Commission, which investigated the departments two or three years ago, that the average salary paid to employees in the Forestry Service was less than was paid to the employees of other departments of the Government.

Mr. MONDELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. SCOTT. Yes.

Mr. MONDELL. Is not that due to the fact that the men who actually do the work in the Forestry Service, the rangers, receive very low salaries; but is not my statement a moment ago also true, that there are more very high salaries in this bureau in proportion than in any other?

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the rangers are paid salaries which are adequate or it would be impossible to supply the places, and I take it that the salaries paid to other officials are such as similar services could command in other employment.

Mr. LAMB. I will state that the average salary is \$900.

Mr. SCOTT. I thank the gentleman for his suggestion. The average salary paid professional employees, I am reminded by the gentleman from New York [Mr. PARSONS], is about \$1,500 a year, and I know of a number of cases in which some of the highest-salaried employees of this bureau have left this service in order to go into private employment, where they could be

paid a larger salary. It must be understood that the men who are charged with the large responsibility of conducting timber sales involving many hundreds, and sometimes many thousands, of dollars, must be high-grade men. They must be expert, skilled men in the timber and lumber business, and such men can not be employed for a paltry sum.

It seems to me that the committee has not erred on the side of extravagance in recommending an increase of \$750,000. The only question we had in our minds was whether we had recommended enough. The Secretary's estimate asked for an increase of \$2,100,000, and we thought when we were cutting it down to \$750,000 we were possibly making a mistake on the side of economy, because there are chances that too great economy in this service may prove to be wasteful extravagance. I pointed out in my opening address the other day that by virtue of the work done in this service there was saved during the past season alone forests to the amount of \$34,000,000 from losses by fire, estimating losses which would have occurred without forest protection by those which did occur in the privately owned forests.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time may be extended for five minutes.

Mr. SCOTT. I do not care to continue it.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mr. MONDELL) there were—ayes 15, noes 47.

So the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

Improvement of the national forests: There is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$600,000, to be expended as the Secretary of Agriculture may direct, for the construction and maintenance of roads, trails, bridges, fire lanes, telephone lines, cabins, fences, and other permanent improvements necessary for the proper and economical administration, protection, and development of the national forests.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the gentleman in charge of the bill a question. As I understand the present administration of forest reserves, it is like a large business, carried on by the Government, and growing more so all the time; that is, the Government is the landlord of an enormous domain, which it rents out for forest purposes, and carries on in that way a business of forestry, grazing, stumpage, selling timber, and the like.

Mr. SCOTT. The gentleman is correct.

Mr. DOUGLAS. That being so, is it contemplated by the committee and by the Government generally to continue this for an indefinite term of years, and to keep control of these forests and to carry on this business, the renting out of land, of water power, and selling timber?

Mr. SCOTT. It is the policy to hold possession perpetually of these national forests, partly to guard against the timber famine which is threatened for the future, partly to protect stream flow, according to the judgment of the Chief Forester, and for other important public purposes.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Then, is it not expected soon, or at least ultimately, that this business, which is nothing more or less than a large commercial business, shall become self-sustaining?

Mr. SCOTT. That is the expectation. The chief forester told the committee this year that he thought next year's receipts would approach \$3,000,000. The receipts last year were about \$1,880,000, and they will be about \$2,000,000 this year.

Mr. DOUGLAS. What were the total appropriations last year for the purpose, and this year?

Mr. SCOTT. The total appropriations last year were something over \$3,000,000. I can give the figures exactly if the gentleman desires.

Mr. DOUGLAS. I think it will be wise to give them.

Mr. SCOTT. The total for the Forest Service during the current year is \$3,896,200.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And the receipts?

Mr. SCOTT. The receipts for this year it is estimated will be something over \$2,000,000, so that as a matter of fact the actual net cost to the country of this service is about a million and a half dollars, but for that million and a half dollars we get fire protection worth many times that amount. We also get all the study and research and investigation, and a great many other important things.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Now, am I right in supposing that the receipts from all sources connected with forest exploitation by the Government are covered into the Treasury?

Mr. SCOTT. Those receipts are covered into the Treasury as miscellaneous receipts.

Mr. DOUGLAS. And we make appropriations out of the Treasury?

Mr. SCOTT. And they are used for appropriations just as receipts from the post-office or any other source of public revenue.

Mr. DOUGLAS. Thank you very much.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I take the floor, I suppose, in opposition to the motion of the gentleman from Ohio—

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. SMITH of California. I desire to say a word on the subject that has just been before us, the matter of the revenues of the forestry department. I characterize it as the greatest outrage that has ever been perpetrated by this Government on any portion of its people. The effort of the forestry department is to grind every dollar that it can get out of the people of the West, and there is no kind of activity carried on in any part of the national forest that is not made to yield money, money, money all the time to the Federal Government. It is written in the law for instance, and in the original act establishing the "forest reserves," as they were then called, that mining should proceed without interruption and be in no way affected by the forestry law, and yet you can not touch a mining proposition within a national forest that the hand of the department is not laid upon your shoulder at once and a fee extorted for the benefit of the National Treasury.

Now, let me give you a specific illustration: A year or two ago a friend of mine, living in my own county, desired to construct a small quartz mill, what we call in the West a "Huntington quartz mill." He started in, as he assumed he had the right to do, to erect it, and being within the limits of a national forest he was proceeding with his work when the forest ranger laid his hand on his shoulder and said: "You can not build a quartz mill in the forest without a permit." And in the course of a year and a half he got his permit upon the condition that he would pay into the Federal Treasury \$50 a year. Now, there is not one syllable of law that justifies the payment of \$50 or 50 cents for a privilege of that kind. And speaking of this matter of privileges, it was stated here yesterday that one of the shining glories of the Forestry Service is that 200,000 permits had been issued in the past year. That means exactly 200,000 interferences with the daily affairs of the farmers and the miners and the stockmen of the West, and a very large per cent of those permits were at the price of a fee which they were obliged to pay into the Federal Treasury without one syllable of authority in law which justified it, and nothing but the greed and the grinding policy of this department of the Government will sustain them in bringing it to the Treasury of the United States.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. And if my friend will permit me an interruption, is not that also true as to the men who, in good faith, attempt to settle on the forest reserves as homesteaders?

Mr. SMITH of California. It is true as to everything that is undertaken in the forest reserve. Now, I want to give another case that came within my knowledge last fall: When I was going from one town to another during the campaign, a gentleman came in the train and sat down beside me and we engaged in conversation. I soon discovered he did not know who I was and what my connection with the forestry department or the Government was. He said he was a bee man, and up the road a way he was going to leave the train and go back to a mountain canyon, where he had a few stands of bees feeding on the bloom of the sage and the tar weed, and those indigenous plants. The forestry department, he said, had laid its hand upon his shoulder and demanded that he pay a tax of 10 cents a hive.

Now, the bee men in the West are among the poorest people. They go into that occupation because they have not the money to engage in farming or in any other general occupation, and every penny which the forest department extorted from that man was the loss of a comfort, yes, a necessity, to his family. It represented some deprivation of some little boy or girl or the hard-working and industrious wife in that man's family. There is neither in sense nor in law any justification for filching these pennies from the pockets of that poor bee man. Now, I speak with some interest and some zeal—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask that I may have five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks that he may have five minutes more time. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. SMITH of California. I speak with some energy and zeal on this, because I plainly foresee that unless a halt is called in this grinding of the people in their everyday affairs there is going to be a reaction and the entire forestry system may be destroyed, and that would be a great calamity. If the Forestry Service will confine itself to its proper functions, it is one of the great institutions of this Government and will result in great good. Not that they are going to enlarge the timber supply extensively, for they are not—that is the biggest humbug in the world—but it is going to conserve the ranges, it is going to benefit the stream flow, and to some extent it will result in reforestation where timber is milled off properly.

I want to say to you, gentlemen, if you have any idea that great and glorious forests are going to be spread over the country which is now designated on the map—and always in green, I believe—as a forest reserve, you are doomed to great disappointment.

The thing that the West needs, industrially, and I refer to the conservation of the timber, the water, and the feed, is rest. Leave it alone and give it the least administration possible, and nature will give you the result. It is largely impractical to set trees out over the forest reserves. A large portion of them are as destitute of timber growth as the roof of this building, because nature never intended that trees should grow where the granite and rock are as near the surface as they are, and where the rainfall is as little. We have all seen certain photographs printed again, and again, and again. All the picture papers in the country and all the magazines and many of the daily papers have printed a picture of a mountain side that seems to be entirely bare, as if the soil and all had slid into the canyon below. That is held up to us as an illustration of the great iniquity that has resulted in this country because there was not a Chief Forester born some generations earlier.

I can show you a forest reserve in my district where for miles and miles there is nothing to be seen but that stony, rocky mountain side, and if there ever was a forest there it disappeared before Adam was born. It was a natural condition, and has no more business to be in a forest reserve, except for the purpose of making places in which to spend money and provide for the activities of that department, than there would be for putting this building into a forest reserve for the purpose of growing a forest all over it.

Mr. PARSONS. Why does the gentleman make that complaint when he says that one of the good results of the Forestry Service would be the improvement of the range?

Mr. SMITH of California. I say that there is neither range, timber, nor anything else on the forest reserve I just spoke of. In the county in which I live the forest reserve is extended out onto the floor of the Mohave Desert, where you can not grow a single thing but lizards. [Laughter.] Nobody undertakes to grow anything there, and a man would be sent to the insane asylum if he would undertake to raise a forest on such land as that.

The activities of the Forestry Service have gone too far in two particulars; first, as I say, in meddling with the everyday activities of the people that live anywhere near it; and, second, spreading the boundaries of the forests over a vast amount of territory that is in no sense forest, in no sense contains a water supply, and is in no sense responsive to any of the legitimate purposes of the Forestry Department.

I wish that department would do two things. First, I wish it would get off of the backs of the people who live in the vicinity of the mountains—in the foothills, where a large majority of the land has passed into private ownership; and, second, I wish it would withdraw its limits from that country which can never be forest, and where there is no water to conserve, and concentrate its efforts on those watersheds well up in the mountains, above settlements, where timber to some extent may be grown, where the range needs some attention, and where there is a chance to conserve the water for irrigation below and to prevent floods from the storms that prevail in those watershed districts.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. PARSONS. I ask that the gentleman be given five minutes more.

Mr. SCOTT. I object.

Mr. CALDER. Mr. Chairman, I ask that the gentleman be given two minutes more.

Mr. SCOTT. I object.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for two minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to continue for two minutes more. Is there objection?

Mr. POLLARD. I object.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, I desire most heartily to concur in what the gentleman from California said in regard to the conditions in his State. Similar conditions exist in the State of Colorado. I will say, gentlemen of the committee, that the prospecting for minerals in my State has almost entirely ceased. Why? On account of the arbitrary action of Mr. Pinchot's bureau. I brought out in the hearings before our Committee on Agriculture from Mr. Pinchot that he was charging the people of my State \$5 per thousand feet for timber worth half the price; that he charges the people of California, Oregon, Washington, Montana, and Utah \$1.90 per thousand feet. When I asked Mr. Pinchot for his authority, he said:

By authority of the Attorney-General of the United States.

Now, gentlemen, what we want in the Forestry Bureau is a little more practicability and less sentiment. The statement was made by the chairman of our committee [Mr. SCOTT], on the statement made to him by Mr. Pinchot, that the receipts for the coming fiscal year would amount to the sum of \$3,000,000. I deny the correctness of that statement. It is well known to all through the forestry regions of this country that to-day the receipts are largely falling off on account of the sale of timber; also the receipts from grazing horses, cattle, and sheep on forest ranges.

Now, gentlemen, I desire to say for your information, with the people of my State, at the last election the question of Judge Taft's and Mr. Bryan's election was not the issue. I want to say in this connection that at no time was I a candidate myself for reelection as Member of this honorable body, but Mr. Pinchot and Pinchotism was one of the issues in my State, and the result was the State went Democratic. [Great laughter.]

Mr. LAMB. Will that be a national calamity? [Laughter.]

Mr. COOK of Colorado. With all due respect to my comrade, Colonel LAMB, I rather think it was, in some respects, in our State. [Laughter.]

Now, gentlemen of the committee, what we want to-day in my State is to carry out the law. We do not want the Chief Forester in Washington here to get to the members of the committee and by misrepresentations have them vote money to enable Pinchot to put 1,400 more employees to work, build up a political machine, and spend hundreds and thousands of the people's money and accomplish no results, when his object, as is well known, is to get Mr. Wilson's position in the Cabinet as Secretary of Agriculture. [Laughter.]

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the paragraph last read, appropriating \$600,000 for so-called "permanent improvements" in the forest reserves. I desire to call the attention of the committee to the fact, already called to their attention by the gentleman from South Dakota, that the improvements proposed under this paragraph can all be carried out under the lump-sum appropriation. This paragraph contains no authorization not contained in the former paragraph. This paragraph is simply an excuse for getting more money. Now, one or two gentlemen have suggested to me that it is strange that one should object to appropriations for improvements within the territory I represent. I object to these improvements because they are unnecessary, because they are extravagantly carried on, because unnecessary improvements on our forest reserves mean an ultimate toll.

The gentleman from Ohio made inquiry a moment ago of the chairman of the committee as to how soon we could expect returns from the forest reserves to equal the expenditures. I think that it is the intention of the Forestry Service within a very short time, if possible, to secure an income much in excess of the outlay. However, that never can be done, no matter how rapidly they sell their timber, if the expenditures are to increase as they have increased in the past few years. I called attention yesterday to the fact that in my State there is one reserve on which the timber is now being cut so rapidly that in ten years there will be practically no standing mature timber on that great reservation. It will require from one hundred to one hundred and fifty years to grow another crop.

Mr. SCOTT. Will the gentleman name the reservation to which he refers?

Mr. MONDELL. When the gentleman asks me to give the name I am embarrassed, for the reason that we have a peculiar condition in the West. It is as though in Illinois and Missouri you should have the names of your counties changed every time the county clerk had a bad spell of indigestion or had the notion strike him that he wanted to name something.

Mr. SCOTT. Perhaps the gentleman will give us the present name.

Mr. MONDELL. This reservation was known as "Medicine Bow Reserve." The Medicine Bow Range is known throughout the West. It is a majestic, towering, snow-capped range, fa-

miliar to all travelers and dwellers in that region for many years by that name, but somebody in the Forestry Service, just to show that he had the power to do so, I suppose, rechristened it.

Day before yesterday I think they called it the "Cheyenne Reserve." To-morrow it may be something else. But we will call it the "Medicine Bow." In ten years, at the present rate of cutting, there will be no considerable amount of large timber on the Medicine Bow, and then there will be at least one hundred and fifty years during which there can be no considerable receipts from timber; but the Forestry Service are forehanded, never forget that. They are laying the foundation for a continual revenue. Last year I called attention to the fact that 500 revocable permits had been issued in the forest reserves of the country for purposes for which the Congress of the United States had given the applicants an easement, and these revocable permits were forced upon these applicants through various procedures of delay and suggestion and intimidation, laying 500 different bases for the collection of a perpetual toll.

The Forestry Service, instead of confining itself to the purposes for which it was created, is attempting to establish over great areas within the Western States federal districts within which the Federal Government shall lay a tax on every industry, within which no man shall operate except he shall pay to the federal taxgatherer. The system is un-American. It is a system that no American Commonwealth will long tolerate.

Mr. PARSONS. Does the gentleman contend that when a man gets a permit for mining in a forest reserve he should pay nothing for the permit?

Mr. MONDELL. I say that since the beginning of the Government we have allowed prospectors to go on the public domain and prospect, we have invited them to do that, and the result has been marvelous development. The law gives them the same right now in the reserves, but the department, unfortunately, is higher and mightier than the law.

Mr. SCOTT. Does the gentleman mean to say that the department denies to any man the right to go upon the reserve for the purpose of prospecting?

Mr. MONDELL. The gentleman desires to be fair.

Mr. SCOTT. I know he does. That is the reason I ask the question.

Mr. MONDELL. I do not understand that the bureau denies the right; it often surrounds the right with so many conditions, with so much red tape, with so much inquiry, with so many conditions as to the use of timber for the building of the prospector's little shack to shelter him while he is carrying on his prospecting work; it so very carefully investigates the question as to whether he has mineral enough that he can afford to pay the Government's price for the land and continue to mine; it surrounds him with so many conditions practically impossible of fulfillment, that the result is that the miner, like the homesteader, has ceased to seek the mountains. The homesteader has learned, as the gentleman from South Dakota has just stated, to shun the forest-reserve region.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Wyoming has expired.

Mr. MONDELL. I ask unanimous consent for five minutes more.

Mr. HASKINS. I object.

Mr. WEEKS. Mr. Chairman, I want to say just a word on this question. I had not intended to take any of the time of the committee, but there have been so many misstatements made, and so many statements which will give a wrong impression to the members of the committee, that I want to correct at least two or three of them.

We have 169,000,000 acres set aside in the forestry reserves. They belong to all the people of this country. They belong to the constituents of every Member upon this floor. They do not belong to the people of the States where they are located, but they belong to all the people. The difficulty with these gentlemen is that their constituents in the past have been in the habit of going onto these reserves and removing timber whenever they saw fit, without paying anything for it. They have been in the habit of grazing their herds on these grazing lands and not paying for it. The gentleman from California says the people in that country are being imposed upon to supply a fund for the National Treasury. The proceeds from grazing and from timber are divided in two parts. One-quarter of the receipts go to the people of the State where the receipts are obtained and three-quarters go into the Treasury as a general fund.

Now, as a matter of fact, there is probably not a single place in the Rocky Mountain section where the Government is charging for stumpage the price that private owners are obtaining for stumpage alongside it. There is not a single place in the Rocky

Mountain section where the Government is charging for grazing the price that private owners are charging for grazing, or which the Indian Bureau of our own Government is obtaining for grazing.

We are receiving from this grazing privilege something like \$800,000 a year. If we received for the same service what would be charged by private owners, or what would be received by the Indian Bureau of our own Government, it would amount to something like \$2,500,000.

Further than that, Mr. Chairman, there is not, in my judgment, a single instance where any charge whatever has been made to any man for taking up or prospecting any mining claim on a government national reserve. The instructions which are given to the range men and the supervisors, which are in print, a copy of which any Member of the House can obtain if he will take the trouble, explicitly instruct the range men to encourage prospectors, and expressly stipulate that no charge whatever shall be made to the prospector on a government reserve.

Mr. MONDELL rose.

Mr. WEEKS. I will yield to the gentleman from Wyoming.

Mr. MONDELL. Did I understand the gentleman to state that the Government had in no instance charged more for stumpage than is charged by private owners?

Mr. WEEKS. I have not been able to find an instance.

Mr. MONDELL. I gave one instance, and had I time I could give a dozen of which I have knowledge where the Government is charging \$5 for stumpage, when a few miles, or perhaps a considerable distance, in the same general region, private parties are selling for a dollar or a dollar and a half.

Mr. WEEKS. Conditions may have been different. I was informed yesterday by a large timber owner who lives at Colorado Springs that he was obtaining \$5 a thousand stumpage for his timber and the Government was selling right alongside, under the same conditions, for \$4.

If gentlemen will take the trouble to look up the hearings before the Agricultural Committee, they will find that only about one-third is being charged by the Government for grazing privileges on national reserves that is being charged by private owners in private localities under the same conditions.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. I will.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. The gentleman from Massachusetts stated that in Colorado a less price was being charged by the Government than was being charged by private individuals for stumpage. I will ask the gentleman if he is aware of the fact that more than 92 per cent of the timber lands in Colorado are in forest reserves?

Mr. WEEKS. I did not mean to say that the charges in one locality are the same that they are in another locality. Charges for stumpage should depend on location, on transportation, and all other incidents that go to make up a proper price.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. Where did the gentleman get the figures about the price for grazing purposes?

Mr. WEEKS. Largely from the testimony that was submitted to the Committee on Agriculture at the hearings held before this bill was presented.

Mr. SMITH of Arizona. How could there be similar conditions in the public grazing lands and those owned by private persons, so that you could make a comparison?

Mr. WEEKS. Comparison was made in several cases, and any examination will show that my statement is correct.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. I desire to say to the gentleman from Massachusetts—

Mr. WEEKS. I believe I have the floor, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. SMITH of California. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. SMITH of California. Is it not true that the lands privately owned are uniformly the best, and therefore there can be no just comparison?

Mr. WEEKS. I will state that my informant told me the conditions were the same, including the cost of transportation, and that he was obtaining \$5 for stumpage where the Government was selling for \$4.

Mr. SMITH of California. My question related to the grazing lands.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. WEEKS. Yes.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. Where are the best timber lands that the gentleman speaks of near Colorado Springs?

Mr. WEEKS. I understood they were near Colorado Springs.

Mr. COOK of Colorado. There are no timber lands near Colorado Springs. Their supply of lumber comes from New Mexico, Texas, Oregon, and Washington.

Mr. WEEKS. I did not intend to locate them at any particular place. The information was given me by the predecessor of the gentleman who has just spoken, and any Member who served with him will believe his statement.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, this matter has been thoroughly thrashed out this year and last year, and I therefore move that debate on this amendment close in five minutes.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I hope that motion will not prevail. This is a new problem, not understood in its workings by eastern Members. I move to amend by making it fifteen minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from California.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion now is on the motion of the gentleman from Kansas.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I would not be understood as making a harsh statement, especially about my friends who represent the Territories in which these forest reservations are, but I take it that as a matter of fact for many years it has so become the custom to loot the public domain that when the Government endeavors to come into its own it looks to them like robbery. For years they cut the forests without paying for it, they herded their stock upon the grazing land without paying for it, and when in course of time the Government wishes to preserve its own, they complain. When I first came into this House the complaint was that the Forestry Service would not administer the national forest reserve with a businesslike administration. The complaint was that there would be no economy in the management of the forest reserves, and now their complaint is that there is too much of a businesslike administration.

Mr. Chairman, it is not necessary to defend Mr. Pinchot on the floor of this House against the assaults which have been made upon him. His work will speak for all time. He has, with the help of other great men of the country, inaugurated a system in this country of inestimable value to future generations. [Applause.] This year, Mr. Chairman, it so happened that I traveled for more than a hundred miles through burning forest fires. I tramped for long distances through the forest in search of some information upon this subject connected with the special committee of which I am a member. The great need of the country, so far as forests are concerned, is, first, fire protection. In Minnesota, in Wisconsin, in Michigan, millions of dollars of property were destroyed for lack of fire protection, and you might just as well expect that a man will preserve his home in this city from fire without a paid fire department as to expect that the forests of the country will be preserved from fire without governmental aid of some kind. [Applause.] Under the regulations and the control of this Forestry Service, our forests, the Government's forests, worth hundreds of millions of dollars, probably a billion or two of dollars, have gone through the past dry season with scarcely a stick destroyed by fire. Wherever a fire started there were the servants of the Government to put it out, but where it started on the private property of the people there it burned, as I know myself. Mr. Chairman, these gentlemen are working against the inevitable. We will continue in our country to have the forest reserves. We will attempt to administer them properly with businesslike methods, and in the end the people who come after the distinguished gentlemen now occupying the floor of this House will thank their Lord that we and not they prevailed in the policies of our country. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the amendment was rejected.

Mr. SMITH of California. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. This discussion generally comes around to a certain stage of misrepresentation, not intentional on anyone's part, when the chairman of the Committee on Agriculture moves to close the debate. I criticize him to that extent and proceed with my remarks. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] endeavors to create the impression in the minds of the House and the country that the Members from the West are opposed to the forestry department and to the system. I positively and emphatically deny that that is true. There are no stancher friends of the Forestry Service, within reasonable limits and for the purpose of preserving and conserving the natural resources of the country in the West, than are the

people of my district. I would go as far as the gentleman from Illinois or any gentleman from any timber country in the preservation of the forests and in the care of the public property of the West.

But I insist that it is not a fair deal, when all of the East and the Middle West have had all of the bounties of nature free, that we who are now struggling with the rockiest proposition that has been presented in the country should be burdened by a system of taxation that reaches into the pockets of every man who dares go upon the public domain.

We are in favor of the Forestry Service. We want the timber preserved, and we do not care to steal any more of it, as the gentleman intimates we have been doing. The law gives to every man living on the forest reserve or in its vicinity free wood for his fuel, and it is not a fair statement to say that the people of the West have been petty larcenists for all of the years past.

The gentleman from Massachusetts has endeavored to make some statements, and has made them, with reference to prices. I say the policy of the Forestry Department is frankly—and I have it in writing from the Chief Forester—to get the last living cent out of whatever it disposes of. A miner a year or two ago wrote to me because the price of timber for his mine had been raised from \$2.50 to \$4 a thousand stumpage, and he wanted it reduced.

I wrote to the Forester, and he gave me this reply: That it had been raised to \$4 a thousand because they found that the man could not get it anywhere else for any less. On another occasion I went with some mining men from my district to meet Mr. Pinchot when he was in Sacramento at the Irrigation Congress a year ago; the miners were asking about some stumpage near their mine, which was remote from a railroad point. He said to them the price of the stumpage would be the price of the lumber at the nearest railroad station, plus the price of hauling it to the mine. Now, that is business; that is the way individuals do business. We take what the traffic will bear; we exact from our neighbors the highest price we can get. But I assert, Mr. Chairman, as positively as I can, that that has never been the policy of the United States Government, and it is a vicious policy for any government to invoke against its people.

Mr. PARSONS. What should be done?

Mr. SMITH of California. I am going to state. The Government of the United States is a government and not a business institution, and it has no more business to go among the people and drive hard bargains, especially at this time in our history, than it has to drive people from their homes. The policy of this Government, from the beginning until within the last five years, has been to pass over the natural resources of the country to the individual and let him have the increment, thereby strengthening himself; and never until within the last few years has the United States Government been a money-making institution in any of its departments.

Mr. PARSONS. To whom is it to be given?

Mr. SMITH of California. Give it to the man who will appropriate it to a useful purpose, exactly as we give to the man who sails a ship the free use of the harbor on which we have spent millions in its improvement. Now, I say this is a fundamental question. It is a question that goes to the policy of the Nation. Are we going to turn this great Republic into a financial institution, grinding from the people the last cent that they will yield, or shall we continue it as a government, a government of individualism, and continue the policy of allowing the man—the individual—to enjoy the natural resources and develop them for his benefit? Ours is not a socialist government; this is not a nation of paternalism; and some day the error of this forest policy will be seen, and we will turn back to true principles as a matter of political wisdom. [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that all debate on this paragraph and all amendments thereto be now closed.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend that motion by providing that debate shall close in ten minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming offers an amendment that all debate be closed upon the paragraph and amendments thereto in ten minutes.

The question was taken, and the motion was rejected.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I now move that all debate close in five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Wyoming moves that all debate close in five minutes.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced the yeas seemed to have it.

On a division (demanded by Mr. MONDELL) there were—ayes 81, noes 20.

So the motion was agreed to.

The CHAIRMAN. The question now is upon the motion of the gentleman from Kansas as amended by the gentleman from Wyoming.

The question was taken, and the motion was agreed to.

Mr. MONDELL. Mr. Chairman, I rather expected that before this debate closed we would hear about "looting" the public domain, and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has not disappointed us. He insists, mildly as the Forestry Service has vehemently, that all those opposed to the present forestry policy are "looters" of the public domain. I tried to answer that briefly yesterday. Mr. Chairman, I, as Assistant Commissioner of the General Land Office, had the honor of forwarding from that office the papers submitted to the President for his signature setting aside one of the largest forest reserves in my State and a number in other Western States.

I had the honor of the authorship of the bill that transferred the forest reserves from the Interior Department to the Agricultural Department. I have always been a friend of proper forest reservation and preservation; I am now. I am opposed to the policy as carried on and to the extravagant expense of the service, an extravagance which, if it were really understood on the floor of this House, would result in the cutting of this appropriation in two, if not in a still further reduction of it.

The Interior Department protected 85,000,000 acres of reserves from fire, as effectually as 160,000,000 are now being protected, with a measly appropriation of \$350,000, and carried on timber sales, made fire guards, built roads, and made trails. Ten times that appropriation is now demanded for twice the area.

Now, Mr. Chairman, I hope the western people will be no longer misunderstood in this matter. We do not complain of a reasonable charge for the products of the reserve, and we never have. We complain rather as to the vexatious conditions under which we must avail ourselves of the use of the reserves. I will tell you a brief story of one of those "looters" who have been referred to.

Three or four years ago I camped one night with a friend beside a little spring in the desert. Along in the evening a four-horse team came into camp. We went out from our tent and found an old gentleman, about 70 years of age, with four horses, and with a little handful of scrubby timber on his wagon. After having helped him take care of his team and prepared supper for him, we inquired why he was coming from the direction of the forested mountains with such a trifling load of almost worthless material. He said that he lived at Burlington, 35 miles below. He had been to Carter Mountain, 35 miles above; in all, 70 miles over a hard road. He went up to the mountains to get some posts and poles to put a fence around his little cabin on his homestead.

The slopes of Carter Mountain are covered for miles with dead timber. That man was a law-abiding citizen, and besides he believed he would be arrested or pursued if he did not find the forester and get his permission to get some dead poles. After hunting about a day he found him. The forester inquired as to whether or no he was entitled to the free use of timber under the law, asking him about his homestead. He said that he had made a homestead entry, but that a mistake had been made in the description, and he had made an application to amend. The application had not been passed upon. So this high and mighty servant of the Federal Government turned that old man back and refused to allow him to have a single stick of timber, although there were millions of feet of it in sight, rotting on the mountain side. The old man came back. Do you think he was as well disposed a citizen when he came back as he was when he started on that journey? On his way back on a rocky slope, that had escaped the scrutiny of the forest service, the old man found the few sticks he had on his wagon when he drove into our camp.

Such cases are innumerable. Mr. Chairman, what we object to is having large areas of our Commonwealths turned into federal districts and having a federal jurisdiction established over every enterprise, over every effort made for the development of these great regions within our State. We believe in individualism, we believe in local control, and we do not believe in unnecessary government paternalism and bureaucracy. [Applause.]

The Clerk read as follows:

BUREAU OF CHEMISTRY.

Salaries, Bureau of Chemistry: One chemist, who shall be chief of bureau, \$5,000; 1 chief clerk, \$1,800; 3 clerks, class 4; 5 clerks, class 3; 7 clerks, class 2; 1 property clerk, \$1,600; 1 clerk, \$1,300; 9 clerks, class 1; 9 clerks, at \$1,000 each; 1 assistant property custodian, \$900; 11 clerks, at \$900 each; 1 engineer, \$1,200; 2 messengers, at \$840 each; 1 skilled mechanic, \$900; 2 skilled laborers, at \$720 each;

1 skilled laborer, \$600; 1 fireman, \$600; 4 messengers or laborers, at \$600 each; 3 messengers or laborers, at \$480 each; 2 messengers or laborers, at \$420 each; 4 charwomen, at \$240 each; in all, \$75,560.

Mr. HEPBURN. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting after the word "dollars," in line 9, page 25, the following:

And an additional \$1,000 so long as the office shall be filled by the present occupant.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 25, line 9, after the word "dollars," insert:

"And an additional \$1,000 so long as the office shall be filled by the present occupant."

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I shall be obliged to reserve a point of order against that.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas reserves a point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. I make the point of order if the gentleman from Iowa does not wish to make any remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will be glad to hear the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] on the point of order.

Mr. HEPBURN. There is no point of order. I submit that the proper procedure is to vote on the amendment.

Mr. KEIFER. A point of order has been made.

Mr. HEPBURN. But no point of order was reserved.

Mr. SCOTT. I reserved it thinking the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. HEPBURN] would like to make a few remarks on the amendment.

Mr. HEPBURN. I do not care to discuss the amendment.

Mr. SCOTT. Then I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair assumes that this is an increase on the salary.

Mr. SCOTT. That is what I had in mind, Mr. Chairman.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For all expenses necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the act of June 30, 1906, entitled "An act for preventing the manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated, or misbranded, or poisonous, or deleterious foods, drugs, medicines, and liquors, and for regulating traffic therein, and for other purposes," in the city of Washington and elsewhere, including chemical apparatus, chemicals and supplies, repairs to apparatus, rent, gas, and electric current, \$136,000; for official traveling expenses, telegraph and telephone service, express and freight charges, \$85,000; for employing such assistants, clerks, and other persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may consider necessary for the purposes named, in the city of Washington, \$200,000; out of the city of Washington, \$266,460.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that part of the paragraph beginning with a semicolon on line 17, down to line 21, and ending with the word "dollars" on line 21, page 27, on the ground that it is not authorized by existing law.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I hope the gentleman will reserve his point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, Mr. Chairman, I think the matter has been discussed here and it is getting late. Let the Chair pass upon the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. I would ask the gentleman from South Carolina to reserve the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Oh, well, I will reserve the point of order.

Mr. SCOTT. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. KAHN. Mr. Chairman, I take it that the language referred to, to which the point of order was reserved, has reference to the so-called "referee board of consulting chemists." I sincerely hope that the gentleman will not insist on his point of order. No one in this House has a higher regard for the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry than I have. The entire world acknowledges the splendid work he has done in connection with pure-food legislation. But at the same time, to place in the hands of one man the terrific power, without appeal, that the pure-food law does may result in the destruction of millions of dollars of invested capital if that one man should decide that a certain material used in the preparation or preservation of food is harmful and deleterious.

Take the conditions that exist in the State of California. A quarter of a century ago that State produced more cereals than any other State in the Union. By degrees its agriculturists have gone out of the business of raising cereals and have gone into the business of raising fruits. As wheat raisers they were practically at the mercy of the Liverpool market, which fixed the price for their commodity, whereas the fruit grower has three avenues for disposing of his crop.

He can sell it when it ripens, in its fresh state; he can dispose of it to the canners; he can dry it and sell it. In recent years, in the process of drying, he has used sulphur dioxide for the purpose of protecting it from the attacks of insects and arresting fermentation. He produces a commodity which has met

the approval of the world, for he finds a market for his product in every civilized country. There are millions of dollars invested in this industry. The Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry is, however, of the belief that the use of sulphur dioxide is harmful and deleterious.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the gentleman from California is not discussing the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order was reserved.

Mr. LEVER. Well, Mr. Chairman, I do not desire that this debate shall go on indefinitely.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman reserved the point of order, and the gentleman from California is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. LEVER. I beg pardon.

Mr. KAHN. The Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry has declared that sulphur dioxide is harmful and deleterious. He threatened to prohibit its use, whereupon the President of the United States appointed this referee board of consulting chemists, consisting of Doctor Remsen, of Johns Hopkins University; Professor Chittenden, of Yale; Professor Long, of the Northwestern University; Doctor Herter, of Columbia University; and Professor Taylor, of the University of California, men of the highest standing in their profession, to investigate these various questions of the use of preservatives. A friend of mine, a chemist, in speaking of the experiments of Doctor Wiley, said, and I think truly, that at times those experiments are not altogether scientific. When Doctor Wiley experiments on a number of people he begins by calling them the "poison squad." This squad is usually made up of young men in the government employ, and before they enter on the experiment he makes them sign an agreement that if their health is injured or impaired by reason of the experiments they will not hold the Government responsible for the injuries sustained.

In other words, he produces a condition of fear in the mind of every man upon whom he experiments, and, in consequence, possibly discovers results that he would not find if experimenting on normal men.

Now, there is in San Francisco a young physician, Doctor Atkins, who has taken great interest in this very subject. He, too, began to experiment. Quite recently he tried a diet of dried fruit upon a squad of tailors, and he called that squad the "health squad." He chose tailors because they lead a sedentary life. He gave them California dried fruit, treated with sulphur dioxide, every day. To one man he gave the fruit three times a day. In practically every case of the eight men upon whom he experimented there was an increase of health at the end of thirty days, and an increase of weight. He had the cooperation in his experiments of five or six of the leading physicians of San Francisco; and yet Doctor Wiley says that this sulphur dioxide is harmful and deleterious and ought to be prohibited.

Why, Mr. Chairman, if this referee board which has been appointed should not be given an opportunity to pass upon this subject, if the word of Doctor Wiley alone should control in the matter, millions of dollars' worth of property of the people of the State of California would practically be destroyed. Doctor Wiley is, no doubt, a most able chemist. But he is not infallible, and there ought to be an appeal from his decision to this board.

Mr. MANN. Will the gentleman yield to a question?

Mr. KAHN. Certainly.

Mr. MANN. I suppose the gentleman is aware that under the pure-food law no one's word can avail except the word of the Supreme Court of the United States?

Mr. KAHN. True; but, Mr. Chairman, before he could have his case heard in the Supreme Court of the United States every orchardist in the State of California would be financially ruined.

I ask unanimous consent that I may be allowed to insert in the RECORD a brief report of Doctor Atkins in reference to his experiments, and also of some chemists who made analyses of the dried fruit used in those experiments.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent to insert in the RECORD the matters referred to. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The matter referred to is as follows:

SAN FRANCISCO, CAL., January 24, 1909.

Hon. JULIUS KAHN,
Washington, D. C.:

I hereby submit to you and the California delegation in Congress a brief report of the results obtained in my recent experiments.

During the past thirty days I have been feeding eight men on a mixed diet of California dried fruits which has been highly sulphured in the drying process. The fruit was selected from the packing houses in different parts of the State, just as it is offered to the trade. The fruit consists of apples, pears, peaches, apricots, and silver plums.

Seven of the men have been eating the fruit once per day at the noon hour; the other man has eaten it three times per day, cooked and raw. The last-mentioned man is Colonel Richardson, who is a police officer working at night. During the test he has eaten 28 pounds of the fruit and says he never felt better in his life. At the beginning his weight was 225 pounds; now his weight is 227 pounds.

The seven men who have eaten the fruit once a day have all thrived except one, who lost 3 pounds, but says he attributes that to the loss of sleep and not to eating the fruit; for he says, "I have derived great benefit from eating the fruit. I have lost considerable sleep and worked very hard during the time." His name is Mr. C. B. Sens.

Mr. A. Lund, who has gained 1½ pounds, says, "I think sulphured fruit is absolutely harmless so far as its effect upon me is concerned." On account of a severe cold Mr. Almqvist lost 3 pounds during the second week of the test, but on the last week gained 4, making him weigh 1 pound more than at the start. He says, "I feel no ill effects from the test."

Mr. F. Nagel has gained 9 pounds during the test, and says, "I feel fully as well as when I began the diet; in fact, my weight shows I have improved."

Mr. J. E. Nordquist weighed, when he began the fruit diet, and at the close tipped the scales at 145 pounds. He says, "I think my whole physical condition has improved; I sleep and feel better than when I began the diet."

Mr. K. Stadem gained exactly 4 pounds, and says, "I do not feel any worse from eating the fruit."

Mr. Henry Stieglitz also gained 4 pounds, and says, "When I began the test my stomach was bad, and I could only eat two meals a day; now I eat three and relish them all."

During the test the weather has been unusually bad, so that the 7 men, who lead sedentary lives, owing to their business (being tailors by profession), were still further hindered from exercise in the open air by the weather. Still further, these men were subjected to considerable heat in the room where they work on account of the gas grates for heating their irons. Notwithstanding all these unhealthy conditions, the "health squad," after undergoing all the usual clinical tests, have made a favorable showing for a California dried-fruit diet. I attribute the general improvement in the condition of the men to the favorable effect of the fruit upon alimentation, as few persons in ordinary life eat sufficient fruit.

The object of this test was to determine by clinical observation if there was any harm in eating California sulphured dried fruit under normal conditions, and I have tried to eliminate fear and imaginary evils from the mind of each subject by appealing to his reason. This same object lesson should be applied to the whole world, as it eats California dried fruit.

In this work I have had the cooperation of Drs. M. Herzstein, J. H. Barbat, E. Majors, Alfred Regensburger, W. H. Hunsaker, Charles Clark, and Prof. Elmer Gates, of Washington, D. C., who make the following reports after a careful investigation of the subjects and fruit.

Doctor Herzstein says, "After testing a box of the dried fruit, I do not find any injurious effects from eating the fruit."

Doctor Majors reports, "I weighed and critically examined the eight men after the thirty-day period they had eaten dried fruit and found all had materially improved in their general health. I have also experimented with my own family and find the effect beneficial with no ill results."

Doctor Regensburger says, "I examined the men at the end of the thirty days and found no cutaneous diseases; in fact, the men have all improved in health."

Dr. W. H. Hunsaker sends a most favorable report and says, "I examined the men at the beginning and at the end of the test and find all have improved in most every respect. My family also thrived on a diet of the fruit during the past month."

Prof. Elmer Gates in a lengthy report says he feels no fear in eating sulphured fruit, which was sent him for experiment, and prefers sulphured to unprotected fruit, for the injurious effects, if any, are less than the injuries and dangers resulting from unprotected fruit.

Luther Burbank in a recent letter to me upon the subject says, "I am convinced that properly sulphured fruit is much more healthful than fruit which has not been so treated."

A chemical analysis of the same fruit as the health squad have been eating has been carefully compiled by the Curtis & Tompkins Chemical Company with the following results, which are absolutely scientific.

See chemical chart.
While I do not claim this test is absolute, nor is it even scientific in its strictest sense, still it points out facts which lead us to believe one is perfectly safe in eating California dried fruit, no matter how much sulphur it may contain, provided he soaks the fruit overnight in cold water, then cooks it. He will find as per chemical chart that there is not sufficient sulphur left to do any harm.

ALBERT J. ATKINS, M. D.

CURTIS & TOMPKINS,
ANALYTICAL, INDUSTRIAL, AND CONSULTING CHEMISTS,
SAN FRANCISCO, January 19, 1909.

Dr. ALBERT J. ATKINS,
San Francisco:

We have examined your samples of fruits (20 samples) received December 31, 1908. Marked 10 dry, as received; 10 cooked, as eaten; and found them to give the following results:

	Sulphurous acid.				Proportion of original dry fruit in cooked material.*
	In original dry fruit.	In cooked fruit as eaten.	Loss due to soaking and cooking of total.*	Grains in 4 ounces of cooked fruit.	
	Per cent.	Per cent.	Per cent.		Per cent.
December 31. Apples....	0.009	0.003	11.1	1/20	0.36
January 1. Pears.....	.116	.032	60.3	1/2	.70
January 2. Silver plums.....	.067	.011	74.7	1/5	.64
January 4. Peaches.....	.204	.043	60.3	3/4	.63
January 5. Apples.....	.007	.002	42.9	1/33	.46
January 6. Pears.....	.118	.043	44.1	3/4	.65
January 7. Apricots.....	.147	.045	51.7	4/5	.63
January 8. Peaches.....	.212	.057	52.8	1.0	.57
January 9. Silver plums.....	.054	.019	40.7	1/3	.59
January 11. Apricots.....	.134	.040	49.3	3/5	.59
Average for 10 days.....	.107	.029	54.1	1/2	.57

* Comparisons with the cooked and dry fruit computed to the same basis.

[SEAL.]

CURTIS & TOMPKINS.

SAN FRANCISCO, January 19, 1909.

Dr. ALBERT J. ATKINS,
1609 Franklin street, City.

DEAR SIR: We inclose herewith reports of our examination of your samples of dried fruits (10 not cooked, 10 cooked), 4 each (2 cooked, 2 dry), of apples, pears, silver plums, peaches, and apricots.

The best understanding of this work may be obtained by consulting the analytical data, which are of necessity greatly condensed.

The general results (loss of sulphur during cooking) of this work agrees with results of similar experiments made by us over a year ago, a copy of which we inclose.

Inasmuch as the same fruits have been consumed by your squad in like proportion (6 times of each kind) for thirty days, a fair average of the amount of sulphur dioxide consumed during this period can be deduced from the results of the 10 cooked samples (2 of each kind). By this means we find that 1 man eating 4 ounces of the cooked fruit per day (daily proportion for each man) would take into his system an average of one-half grain of sulphur dioxide per day; or, in other words, during the entire month he would eat 120 ounces (about 8 pounds) of the cooked material, equivalent to 67.5 ounces (4.2 pounds) of the original dried fruit, and from which he would obtain about 15 grains of sulphur dioxide during the entire experimental period.

This diet would furnish to the individual at any one time a minimum dose of about one thirty-third of a grain, and a maximum of about 1 grain of sulphur dioxide.

Some inconsistencies are apparent in the tables, which are naturally to be expected, as the practice of each cooking is not controlled with any degree of precision; and the fruits themselves vary greatly, even those sulphured at the same time. This latter fact is due in part to an unequal absorption of sulphur by the ripest and less ripe fruits, as well as to the variation in size, etc.

Under these conditions it will be readily seen that only general results can be obtained either in the laboratory or in commercial practice. Furthermore, the freshly sulphured fruit rapidly loses a considerable proportion of its sulphurous acid and continues to diminish, but less rapidly, as the sulphur contents diminish. Therefore the fruits used in this investigation will show a lower per cent of sulphur in a month, and still less after a longer period.

We will gladly furnish any further information which you may desire regarding this subject from the chemist's standpoint. Thanking you for your order, we are,

Yours, very truly,

CURTIS & TOMPKINS,
By P. W. TOMPKINS.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I insist on the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman restate his point of order?

Mr. LEVER. The point of order is that this section carrying the words beginning on line 17, after the semicolon, and ending on line 21, after the word "dollars," page 27, is contrary to existing law and not authorized by existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman inform the Chair which portion of the language he considers out of order?

Mr. LEVER. I consider the whole clause that I have named out of order. There is nothing in the pure food and drug act which authorizes this language making the appropriation, and there is no other law.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman, I wish to direct the attention of the Chairman to another point: That the appropriation for all expenses necessary for carrying into effect the pure-food act is in the provision above, and if all the expenses are provided for in the paragraph above, there can be no authority for this particular appropriation.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, it seems to me that the point made by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] and the point made by the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] are not well taken. There is an act of Congress authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to employ such persons as Congress may from time to time authorize him to employ; that is to say, as Congress may from time to time make appropriations to enable him to employ. And in reference to the point made by the gentleman from Texas, it is obvious that the word "all" is intended to extend over the remainder of the paragraph and to include those parts of the paragraph to which he has called attention as well as the first lines of it. The case seems so clear that I do not care to take time to argue it further.

The CHAIRMAN (Mr. FOSTER of Vermont). The Chair desires to call the attention of the committee to the following language in section 523 of the Revised Statutes, being a portion of the organic act establishing the Department of Agriculture:

He—

Referring to the Secretary of Agriculture—

shall appoint such other employees as Congress may from time to time provide, with salaries corresponding to the salaries of similar officers in other departments of the Government; and he shall, as Congress may from time to time provide, employ other persons for such time as their services may be needed, including chemists, botanists, entomologists, and other persons skilled in natural sciences pertaining to agriculture.

Now, that is very broad authority. The Chair also desires to call attention to the language in another statute, section 169 of the Revised Statutes, which reads as follows:

Each head of a department is authorized to employ in his department such number of clerks of these several classes recognized by law, and such messengers, assistant messengers, copyists, watchmen, laborers, and other employees, and at such rate of compensation respectively as may be appropriated for by Congress from year to year.

This language has from time to time been held sufficient authority for an appropriation in a general appropriation bill, and it seems to the Chair that this language that has just been read is analogous to the language in the organic act of the Department of Agriculture.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I suppose the Chair is about to overrule the point of order, and I wish to offer an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair desired, first of all, to call the attention of the gentleman to the state of things under the organic act, and the Chair will now be glad to hear anything further on the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to have the Chair make a ruling.

Mr. BURLESON. Before the Chair rules, I want to direct his attention to the fact that the particular paragraph against which the point of order has been raised, considering its phraseology, can not be claimed to be based on the organic act creating the Department of Agriculture. You will notice that it follows immediately a provision or paragraph which provides for "all expenses to carry into effect the pure-food act." Hence it relies for its validity in this bill upon the provision of the pure-food law. Now, Mr. Chairman, there is absolutely no authority in the pure-food law for the paragraph against which the point of order is raised, and you can not escape the conclusion that the paragraph purports to rest upon the pure-food act, for the concluding part of the paragraph objected to includes these words:

Assistants, clerks, and such other persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may consider necessary for the purposes named.

What purposes named. Why, you look to the paragraph immediately preceding, which provides for all expenses necessary to carry into effect the provisions of the pure-food act.

As I see it, the Chair can not possibly escape the conclusion that this paragraph depends for its right to remain in this bill upon the provisions of law contained in the pure-food law, and if there is no provision in the pure-food law authorizing the Secretary of Agriculture to employ such assistants and clerks and other persons as he may see fit, and so forth, then this item necessarily must fall to the ground. In the pure-food act there is no such authorization; hence, I say, the Chair should sustain the point of order.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

The committee informally rose; and Mr. WEEKS having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, a message from the Senate, by Mr. CROCKETT, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed the following resolutions, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

Senate concurrent resolution 86.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey to be made of the harbor at Blaine, Wash., to determine the cost and advisability of its improvement.

Senate concurrent resolution 82.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made to ascertain the most feasible and practicable route to build a canal or inland waterway on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, connecting St. Andrews Bay, in the State of Florida, and the Mississippi River near New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, with a view to determining the advantage, best location, and probable cost of such canal or inland waterway, and to submit a plan and an estimate for such improvements.

Senate concurrent resolution 83.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of Popham Beach, Maine, with a view to the building of a bulkhead or breakwater along said beach for the protection of property of the United States, and to prevent the deposit of sand in navigable waters adjacent thereto.

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 8906. An act to provide for the retirement of certain officers on the active list of the Regular Army who have been passed over in promotion by officers junior to them in length of commissioned service.

AGRICULTURAL APPROPRIATION BILL.

The committee resumed its session.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, when the pure-food law was passed, it was in the mind of Congress that the organic act creating the department did authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to appoint clerks, and assistants, and so forth. It seems to me that the only question here is as to whether this portion of the paragraph—

and such other persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may consider necessary for the purposes named—

is subject to a point of order. Upon reflection, it would seem to me that the authority to employ such other persons as may be needed is practically the same thing, identically the same

thing, as the employment of such other persons as the Secretary of Agriculture may consider necessary, because the persons who may be needed are to be judged by the Secretary. While the language is not precisely the same, the authority is precisely the same.

The CHAIRMAN. The pure food and drug law simply unloaded an additional subject upon the Department of Agriculture. In itself it afforded no additional machinery of administration. As the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] has indicated, it was believed at the time that the organic act provided the method for furnishing this machinery. The Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. LEVER. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out, after the semicolon, in line 17, page 27, all the words down to "dollars," on line 21, and to insert thereafter the following, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Strike out all after the word "dollars" in line 17, page 27, and insert, after the semicolon, the following:

"For the examinations of specimens of foods and drugs, made in the Bureau of Chemistry, under the direction and supervision of such bureau for the purpose of determining from such examination whether such articles are adulterated or misbranded within the meaning of said act, in the city of Washington, \$200,000; out of the city of Washington, \$266,460."

Mr. POLLARD. Mr. Chairman, I wish to reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. LEVER. That amendment is written in the language of section 4 of the food and drug act of June 30, 1906, and I say frankly that it is intended to eliminate the operation of the so-called "referee board of consulting chemists." I tried to point out yesterday that this referee board was appointed in violation of law. I tried to point out that the referee board was appointed at the behest of manufacturers who were not obeying the pure food and drug act of 1906. I pointed out, Mr. Chairman, that there was no necessity for the use of any of these chemicals in canned goods and foods. I pointed out, I think, clearly that the operation of this referee board of consulting chemists had the effect of tying the hands of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, whose statutory duty it is to enforce the pure food and drug act of 1906. I pointed out, too, that the exercise of the functions of this referee board of consulting chemists acted in the nature of an absolute superseding of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry in the performance of the duties imposed upon it by law.

In this connection, Mr. Chairman, I want to read for the information of the Committee of the Whole a portion of a letter just received from the Secretary of Agriculture. At the proper time I will ask for permission to insert the whole letter, in justice to the Secretary, but I want at this point to read this portion, which bears upon this proposition:

You ask what duties in the Bureau of Chemistry are assigned to members of the referee board, and whether these gentlemen act under the authority of the chief of the bureau. No duties in the Bureau of Chemistry are assigned to these men. They are all connected with prominent universities and have their own laboratories. They do not do any work under the authority of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry.

I call especial attention to that language:

They do not do any work under the authority of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry.

Let me put alongside of that language the language of the statute, the language that we passed, the language that we intended to have obeyed in the enforcement of the pure food and drug act. I read from section 4 of the act—

That the examinations of specimens of food and drugs shall be made in the Bureau of Chemistry of the Department of Agriculture, or under the direction or supervision of such bureau.

Yet we are told by the Secretary of Agriculture that this extra legally appointed referee board is not connected with the Bureau of Chemistry and does not exercise its authority in conformance with the directions of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry.

Mr. COLE. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. COLE. Does the gentleman contend that the findings of the Bureau of Chemistry are absolutely binding upon the Secretary of Agriculture?

Mr. LEVER. I contend that the law points out just exactly what the Secretary of Agriculture shall do with the facts furnished to him by the Bureau of Chemistry. The facts are handed to the Secretary, as I understand it, and if, in his judgment, it seems to him that a good case has been made, a fair case has been made, those facts are certified to the proper district attorney of the proper federal court. The Secretary of Agriculture has no discretion in the matter. The data is collected by the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry or those acting under the

direction of the chief. But I want to read further from the letter of the Secretary referring to this board. He says:

They report directly to me.

Mr. Chairman, they do not report to the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, but to him, the Secretary of Agriculture. He continues:

The law speaks to me and says that I must keep out of foods substances which are deleterious to health. When great conflicts of scientific opinion arises concerning the deleteriousness of a particular substance, I refer that substance to the referee board—

Oh, no; not to the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry, as provided in section 4 of the pure-food act; not at all; but to the referee board—

and an elaborate scientific investigation is conducted to determine whether the substance is harmful.

Mr. Chairman, I want to call the attention of the committee to the fact that section 4 of the act provides that this scientific investigation shall be made by the Bureau of Chemistry or under the supervision of the Bureau of Chemistry, and you can not get away from the fact.

Mr. TAWNEY. Will the gentleman permit a question?

Mr. LEVER. Yes.

Mr. TAWNEY. Does the pure-food act also authorize the appointment of this referee board?

Mr. LEVER. I have searched the pure-food act carefully night after night for more than a week, and I say to the gentleman that there is not an iota of language in it which authorizes the appointment of this referee board of consulting chemists, nor any other law so far as that is concerned. I read further from the Secretary's letter:

My action in allowing or excluding a substance is based upon—

Based on what? Based on the report of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry? Based on the findings of those acting under the supervision or direction of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry? Not at all.

My action in allowing or excluding a substance is based upon the report of this board, which is made directly to me.

A board illegal in its make-up; a board absolutely exercising authority which this Congress did not give.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

The letter referred to, with inclosures, is as follows:

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, February 3, 1909.

Hon. A. F. LEVER,
House of Representatives, Washington, D. C.

DEAR MR. LEVER: I am sending you the information requested in your two letters of the 1st instant regarding the referee board of consulting scientific experts and the board of food and drug inspection. Most of the information which you desire concerning the referee board is contained in a letter which I have written to Mr. SCOTT, the chairman of the House committee, on January 13, 1909, and I am taking the liberty of inclosing a copy of this letter. You ask what duties in the Bureau of Chemistry are assigned to the members of the referee board, and whether these gentlemen act under the authority of the chief of the bureau. No duties in the Bureau of Chemistry are assigned to these men. They are all connected with prominent universities and have their own laboratories. They do not do any work under the authority of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry. They report directly to me. The law speaks to me, and says that I must keep out of foods substances which are deleterious to health. When grave conflict of scientific opinion arises concerning the deleteriousness of a particular substance I refer that substance to the referee board, and an elaborate scientific investigation is conducted to determine whether the substance is harmful. My action in allowing or excluding the substance is based upon the report of this board, which is made directly to me. I think, with this statement and the copy of my letter to Mr. SCOTT, you will be able to answer any questions which may arise in the course of the debate.

The formation of the Board of Food and Drug Inspection is also treated in my letter to Mr. SCOTT, but you ask for the orders and official documents relating to the creation of the board, and I am sending you a copy of the order. I also send a copy of Doctor Dunlap's appointment. General Order No. 111 defines the duties of the Board of Food and Drug Inspection, as follows:

"The board will consider all questions arising in the enforcement of the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, upon which the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture is necessary, and will report its findings to the Secretary for his consideration and decision. All correspondence involving interpretations of the law and questions arising under the law, not theretofore passed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture, shall be considered by the board. The board is directed to hold frequent meetings at stated times in order that findings may be reported promptly."

"In addition to the above duties, the Board of Food and Drug Inspection shall conduct all hearings based upon alleged violations of the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, as provided by regulation 5 of the Rules and Regulations for the Enforcement of the Food and Drugs Act, approved October 17, 1906."

Doctor Dunlap acts in the capacity of secretary to the board.

To particularize the duties of Doctor Dunlap, his work is confined wholly to the subject of the food and drugs act, and while by title associate chemist in the Bureau of Chemistry, he is in no way connected with the administrative work of the bureau.

His time is devoted to:

1. *Hearings.* These hearings are necessary under section 4 of the food and drugs act. The Board of Food and Drug Inspection sits as

a board at these hearings, and stenographic notes are taken of them. This is done by the force in Doctor Dunlap's office, and the records of the board are kept on file there. Hearings on general topics of interest are conducted by the board, frequently in view of a proposed publication of an important question under the food and drugs act, as, for example, the case of hearings on coffee, mineral waters, bleached flour, etc. Hearings before the board are also frequently had on appeal from cases heard at the various port laboratories.

2. *Executive sessions.*—These are held regularly twice a week, or oftener if need be, and are given over to the consideration of important questions affecting the enforcement of the act, such as questions of interpretation, cases arising for prosecution under the act, and important questions raised in connection with correspondence. As secretary of the board, Doctor Dunlap keeps the minutes of executive sessions, and presents all the matter at the meetings for the consideration of the board.

3. *Correspondence.*—All correspondence affecting the food and drugs act passes through Doctor Dunlap's hands for consideration, and he, personally, handles as much of the correspondence as time allows. Especially is this true of letters which require the signature of the Secretary of Agriculture. Only by such control is consistency of action on the part of the department obtainable.

4. Doctor Dunlap also personally supervises the preparation of the letters for the signature of the Secretary, which are to be sent to the Secretary of the Treasury, dealing with imported foods and drugs, indicating the offense under the act. These letters are afterwards considered by the other members of the board before being submitted to the Secretary for consideration.

5. Doctor Dunlap prepares all letters for the consideration of the board, where, in his opinion, imported foods and drugs should be released at the ports. These letters are afterwards submitted to the Secretary of Agriculture for his consideration and approval.

6. He handles personally considerable correspondence on food and drug matters affecting the interpretation of the act; these letters go to the chiefs of the food laboratories. He also handles largely the correspondence coming to Washington on questions affecting imports, where such letters are sent by importers or other interested parties.

7. He considers, as a member of the board, all recommendations to the Secretary of Agriculture for seizures under section 10 of the act.

8. All the evidence in cases of adulterated or misbranded foods, when the cases are complete, is considered by him, as a member of the board, and, after an expression of opinion as to the proper action to take, the cases are passed to the other members of the board for their vote.

9. He has also given a portion of his time to the preparation of briefs on various subjects, at the request of the Secretary of Agriculture and the President (corn sirup, bleached flour, etc.), and also in briefing chemical data on questions under the food and drugs act, which have been submitted to the Attorney-General.

10. All cases, before citations are issued for hearings under section 4 of the act, pass through his hands, and it is left to him to decide when citations are to be issued.

11. Part of his time is given over to consultation with those who come to inquire on points of labeling, or on any other points where advice might be given or asked concerning the food and drugs act.

I trust this will give you the information you desire, but if there is anything further, I should be glad to furnish it upon your request.

Very sincerely,

JAMES WILSON, Secretary.

JANUARY 13, 1909.

HON. CHARLES F. SCOTT,
Chairman Committee on Agriculture,
House of Representatives.

DEAR SIR: On February 20, 1908, I appointed five men consulting scientific experts of this department, and on February 24, 1908, I organized them into a board called the "referee board."

I appointed these men under a provision in the agricultural appropriation bill which authorizes me to employ such assistants as I may consider necessary to secure the enforcement of the pure-food law.

I organized them into a board under authority of section 161 of the Revised Statutes, which authorizes the head of each department to prescribe regulation not inconsistent with law for the government of his department. Section 161 reads:

"The head of each department is authorized to prescribe regulations not inconsistent with law for the government of his department, the conduct of its officers and clerks, the distribution and performance of its business, and the custody, use, and preservation of the records, papers, and property appertaining to it."

The men so appointed are Dr. Ira Remsen, president of Johns Hopkins University; Dr. Russell H. Chittenden, of Yale; Dr. John H. Long, of the Northwestern University; Dr. Alonzo E. Taylor, of the University of California; and Dr. C. A. Herter, of New York. Their duties are to determine the wholesomeness or deleterious character of such foods or articles used in foods as I may refer to them for such determination.

The law says to me that foods which are deleterious in themselves or which contain deleterious substances shall not be shipped in interstate commerce. It should be remembered that the pure-food law and the appropriation act speak to the Secretary of Agriculture. Examinations of samples are to be made by the Bureau of Chemistry, but the enforcement of the law is with me. It is necessary for me to know definitely whether certain articles are deleterious or not, and where there is grave conflict of scientific opinion on the question, I refer the subject to this board.

I have referred three subjects—benzoate of soda, sulphur dioxide, and saccharine. No reports have been received by me from the referee board on these subjects, but I am expecting a report on benzoate of soda and on saccharine about March 1 next. The members of the board are paid \$25 a day for each day they are actually employed, and so far they have received in salary a total of \$4,703.04, and the expense of the investigations conducted by them on the subjects of benzoate of soda and saccharine have been \$27,110.84.

The referee board was appointed because certain large manufacturers of foodstuffs asked thorough investigation by the most distinguished scientists in the land. They asked the President to select a number of disinterested scientific men competent to pass upon the question, and stated that if these men found that sulphur dioxide, saccharine, and benzoate of soda were harmful, they would, of course, immediately discontinue their use. The President corresponded with the presidents of a number of the leading universities of the country, who suggested certain names to him, from which he made the selection of the five men I have heretofore named, and these men were appointed by me and organized into a board, as stated.

It will be remembered that when the pure-food law was under discussion before a committee of the House, the view was expressed that the Secretary of Agriculture should be allowed a free hand in selecting experts of renown on questions of the wholesomeness of certain foods and articles used in foods, and this had always been my position. Apparently, it was endorsed by the Congress when they included the item in the agricultural appropriation bill giving me authority to employ such persons as I considered necessary for the enforcement of the law, and I have used the discretion confided in me by Congress.

I may say that it is my personal opinion that it is necessary to have the opinion of five eminent, disinterested experts as to the wholesomeness or unwholesomeness of benzoate of soda, saccharine, and sulphur dioxide.

BOARD OF FOOD AND DRUG INSPECTION.

When the department started in to enforce the pure-food law, I was looking to the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry to handle the administrative details and the chemical end of the work, and to the department solicitor to handle the legal work, and to these two officials jointly to report to me on such details as required my personal action, such as the exclusion of adulterated and misbranded foods or drugs offered for import, advice as to prosecutions, etc.

I soon discovered that we were needing another chemist to devote his whole time to the work of enforcing the law. The Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry has many other duties in addition to his duties under the pure-food law. The questions to be considered are important, and the decisions are more generally accepted when they are not a one-man product.

To get this additional man, the presidents of some of the leading universities in the country were consulted, and finally Dr. F. L. Dunlap, of the University of Michigan, was appointed, under the strong recommendation of President Angell. Doctor Dunlap was appointed under the authority conferred upon me in the agricultural appropriation act.

Coincident with Doctor Dunlap's appointment, under authority of section 161, Revised Statutes, I organized the Board of Food and Drug Inspection, consisting of the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry as chairman, Dr. F. L. Dunlap, and Mr. George P. McCabe. This board acts for me. This board advises me on matters concerning which the pure-food law says I must make a decision. It in no way interferes with the duty assigned by the pure-food law to the Bureau of Chemistry. This duty is the examination of samples, and this is the sole duty imposed upon the Bureau of Chemistry by the food and drugs act. This duty that bureau now performs.

I inclose a statement, showing in detail the expenses of the referee board from February 20 to December 31, 1908, inclusive.

Very truly, yours,

JAMES WILSON, Secretary.

General Order No. 111.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1907.

There is hereby created in the Department of Agriculture a board of food and drug inspection. The members of the board will be Dr. Harvey W. Wiley, Chief, Bureau of Chemistry, chairman; Dr. Frederick L. Dunlap, associate chemist, Bureau of Chemistry; and Mr. George P. McCabe, Solicitor of the Department of Agriculture. The board will consider all questions arising in the enforcement of the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, upon which the decision of the Secretary of Agriculture is necessary, and will report its findings to the Secretary for his consideration and decision. All correspondence involving interpretations of the law and questions arising under the law not heretofore passed upon by the Secretary of Agriculture shall be considered by the board. The board is directed to hold frequent meetings at stated times in order that findings may be reported promptly.

In addition to the above duties, the board of food and drug inspection shall conduct all hearings based upon alleged violations of the food and drugs act of June 30, 1906, as provided by regulation 5 of the rules and regulations for the enforcement of the food and drugs act, approved October 17, 1906.

JAMES WILSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,
Washington, D. C., April 25, 1907.

Mr. Frederick L. Dunlap, of the State of Michigan, is hereby appointed associate chemist of the Bureau of Chemistry and a member of the Board of Food and Drug Inspection in the United States Department of Agriculture, at a salary at the rate of \$3,500 per annum, on the miscellaneous roll paid from the fund appropriated for the "Enforcement of the food and drugs act, 1907."

The above-named appointee is hereby required to take the oath of office immediately and file the same, together with a statement of legal and actual residence and personal record, with the appointment clerk in the Department of Agriculture, and report for duty in person to the Secretary of Agriculture, and be subject to the rules and orders of the Secretary of Agriculture. This appointment shall take effect on the appointee taking the oath of office and reporting for duty.

JAMES WILSON,
Secretary of Agriculture.

A true duplicate copy.

R. W. ROBERTS,
Acting Appointment Clerk,
United States Department of Agriculture.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, I move that debate on the pending paragraph close at 5 o'clock.

The motion was agreed to.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, the people of California believe in the pure-food law. We are not opposed to the amendment of the gentleman from South Carolina because we are opposed to any part of that law; but I hope the amendment will not prevail, because I believe that a referee board such as has been provided by the Secretary of Agriculture is absolutely necessary for the proper administration of the pure-food act. This board was appointed because, as the Secretary has well said in his letter, there was great difference of opinion among chemists upon certain subjects upon which, under that law, he

was called to act. One of the matters submitted to this referee board is the question of the use of sulphur in the curing of fruit, and I think that the condition of this question shows clearly that this board is absolutely necessary.

Mr. LEVER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HAYES. Yes.

Mr. LEVER. I would like to ask the gentleman from California if it is his contention that there is anywhere in any law authority for the appointment of this referee board of consulting chemists?

Mr. HAYES. Yes; my contention is that there is ample authority, not only in the general law as read from the Chair, but in the pure-food act as well.

Mr. LEVER. I should be glad to have the gentleman put his finger upon it.

Mr. HAYES. That is settled; the Chair has already ruled that the language in the bill is in order and was not opposed to any existing law. That settles that so far as this bill is concerned. In the early stages of the administration of the pure-food law this matter came before the Bureau of Chemistry, and Doctor Wiley held that more than 350 milligrams of sulphur dioxide per kilogram of dried fruit was deleterious to health, thus holding, so far as I know, contrary to the universal opinion of chemists on this subject all over the world.

The rule of the German chemists has been for years that 1,050 milligrams per kilogram of fruit was not deleterious, which is three times the amount that Doctor Wiley has held to be the safe limit.

Mr. ROBERTS. Milligrams of what?

Mr. HAYES. Of sulphur dioxide. Now, the people of California have treated their fruit with sulphur, and they have for years easily met this limit of the German chemists and the French chemists and the chemists of all the governments of the world; yet the ruling of Doctor Wiley, if enforced, would destroy the dried-fruit business. As my colleague has already pointed out, it would cause the loss of millions of dollars invested in this business in California. Now, if the referee board, to whom this matter is referred, should finally find that Doctor Wiley is correct in his conclusion, then, of course, we must abide by that decision, and we are ready to do so; but until it is thus determined by the highest authority I think that the Congress of the United States ought to permit the Secretary to use the method which, under the law, he has provided to determine whether or not Doctor Wiley is correct in his conclusion that anything more than 350 milligrams of sulphur dioxide to the kilogram of fruit is deleterious.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from California has expired.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent for one minute more.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from California asks unanimous consent that his time be extended for one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HAYES. Now, Mr. Chairman, we have no criticism to make of Doctor Wiley. We have no doubt he is an honest man and is doing what he thinks is his duty, but all men are mortal and liable to err. What we ask in this matter is that the law as the Secretary has interpreted it may continue to be administered, and in this manner all disputed questions may be decided by the referee board, which is composed of men of such high authority in chemistry that when their decision is once announced no one will think of questioning the correctness of their conclusion, whatever it may be.

Mr. HUGHES of New Jersey. Mr. Chairman, this amendment, as I understand it, is aimed to eliminate what seems to be known as the "referee board." Unless I am absolutely mistaken in the premises, this referee board has been appointed practically without authority of law. In other words, as it strikes the ordinary man interested in the administration of the pure-food law, it would seem as though, having passed a law intended to correct a great many evils and abuses, a certain number of people interested in the continuation of those evils and abuses have been powerful enough to have the operation of the law suspended by having this referee board called into existence. If we are going to establish a court of errors and appeals in this matter of pure food, let us do it by law and not by indirection. If it is true that the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry is not competent to perform the duties of his office and it is necessary to call in these gentlemen with high-sounding names and titles to check up his rulings, let us do it, but let us do it in the light of day; let us do it in the face of the people of the country, who I believe want this law, and who I believe are in favor of its enforcement, and who I believe are behind the Secretary of Agriculture and Doctor Wiley in the manner in which they have directed the enforcement of it.

Now, what is the situation as we find it presented to us here to-day? Just as soon as any body of men interested in the continuation of the sale and distribution of impure food are powerful enough to approach the officers of the Government they, too, may have a referee board appointed. Nobody can possibly know where they are at in this matter. This referee board which makes this last report only removes the subject once more into the domain of doubt and controversy. They set about the well-nigh impossible task of proving a negative. It would be impossible for them to prove actually what they have attempted to prove and say that there were no deleterious substances used in the manufacture of these goods. Of course they can cite the fact that these substances did not deleteriously affect this man or that man, or this or that body of men, but that does not prove anything. It would take a thousand times that amount of testimony to offset the direct results obtained by the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry when he, acting under the law, acting with all the authority given to him, proves and submits in his report that such substances are deleterious and—

Mr. KAHN. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from New Jersey has expired.

Mr. KAHN. I ask that the gentleman be given one minute more in order to answer a question.

Mr. SCOTT. I am obliged to object, because the time of debate has been limited. I now yield two minutes to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. TOWNSEND].

Mr. TOWNSEND. Mr. Chairman, personally, I can conceive of nothing more deleterious to the impartial enforcement of the pure-food legislation than the passage of this amendment, which would put in the hands of one man, however good he might be, however wise—and I am not questioning the wisdom of the chief chemist—the power to decide, without review, all great questions of this kind. I have not heard—

Mr. BURLESON. The courts can review his actions.

Mr. TOWNSEND. I have not heard one word of criticism as to the character of this board. It is composed of eminent chemists of national reputation and unquestioned character; and yet because the board did not agree with the Chief of the Division of Chemistry it is proposed to abolish the many and retain the one.

I contend, Mr. Chairman and gentlemen, that this law contemplated that the Secretary of Agriculture should carry out its provisions, that he was to promulgate rules and regulations for enforcing it, and that the appointment of the board was under his advice and with his consent. The spirit and intent of the law has been complied with and great good to the people has been secured, and at the same time no honest manufacturer has been injured by the proper regulations which have been established.

I submit, Mr. Chairman, that we ought to be very careful before we confer such powers as have been conferred in the pure-food law upon one man, for even though, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BURLESON] suggests, the courts might review his action, they could not review it until possibly much legitimate business of the country had been destroyed or disastrously affected. The argument thus far advanced in favor of the amendment is the claim that the board is not legally constituted. The ruling of the Chair on the point of order settles the legality of the matter, so far as the House is concerned; and inasmuch as common fairness, as well as the ultimate success of the pure-food law, depends upon its just interpretation and the highest degree of scientific ability employed in fixing standards, and inasmuch as there has been no argument against the board and no denial that it is in the highest degree efficient, I hope the amendment will fail.

Mr. BURLESON. Let me ask the gentleman—

Mr. TOWNSEND. I am fearful I have occupied my two minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Chairman, the very clear and comprehensive decision of the Chair in passing upon the point of order raised by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER] seems to leave it unnecessary to further discuss the question of the legality of the appointment of this board of referees. I will pass that, therefore, and call attention to the effect of the amendment that has now been offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER], and which, if it should prevail, would bring about the anomalous condition of a bureau chief within a department having greater power than the secretary in charge of that department. If this amendment prevails it means that the Secretary of Agriculture shall have no authority to review a decision which is made by one of his bureau chiefs, or to call upon anybody else to help him reach a determination

in regard to the justice of that view and the wisdom of it. That would be a condition so intolerable from every standpoint of good administration that I can not believe this committee will be willing to support a proposition which will bring it about.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee and Mr. BURLESON rose.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCOTT. I am obliged to decline to yield. The only other point to be considered by the committee is the wisdom of the action of the Secretary in appointing this board of referees. And that is a question also which seems to need no longer discussion than the minute which I have left. It has already been referred to by both the gentlemen from California [Mr. HAYES and Mr. KAHN], who called attention to the enormous industrial and commercial interests that were at stake, great industries that were in danger of destruction if the dictum announced by the Chief of the Bureau of Chemistry should be permitted to stand as the law. Undoubtedly the Secretary of Agriculture exercised wisely the discretion vested in him when, in view of the possibility of irreparable injury to great commercial interests, he determined that the question should not be deemed settled until the last word had been spoken.

And I venture to say that there is not a court in the United States but would hold that the last word has been spoken upon any chemistry proposition when the gentlemen named as members of the board of referees have passed upon it, because they are the most eminent in their profession in the United States.

Mr. BURLESON. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. SCOTT. The wisdom of the Secretary's action therefore seems to be as indisputable as the legality of it, and I trust that the amendment will be voted down.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. All time has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from South Carolina [Mr. LEVER].

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the noes seemed to have it.

Mr. LEVER. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee divided; and there were—ayes 53, noes 41.

Mr. SCOTT. Tellers, Mr. Chairman. And pending that request, I move that the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. Pending the request for tellers, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCOTT] moves that the committee do now rise.

The question was taken, and the Chair announced that the ayes seemed to have it.

Mr. LEVER. Division, Mr. Chairman.

The committee again divided; and there were—ayes 50, noes 42.

The committee accordingly rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. FOSTER of Vermont, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the bill H. R. 27053, the agricultural appropriation bill, and had come to no resolution thereon.

JUSTICES OF THE PEACE COURTS IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the bill (S. 6350) to change the name and jurisdiction of the inferior court of justice of the peace in the District of Columbia, with the House amendment disagreed to by the Senate.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House insist upon its amendment and agree to the conference asked.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none. The Chair announces the appointment of Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. OLCOTT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky, as conferees on the part of the House.

ILLUMINATING GAS.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent for the present consideration of the following order.

The Clerk read as follows:

House Order No. 24.

Ordered. That the Committee on the District of Columbia be, and hereby are, authorized to investigate the quality and composition of the illuminating gas furnished in the District of Columbia, and to send for persons and papers.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. Reserving the right to object, have they not been investigating that for the last three or four weeks?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. There have been five or six witnesses before the committee.

Mr. CLARK of Missouri. What do you want with the order then?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. We desire to make a further investigation. There has been some claim made by some of the witnesses that it would cost five to seven millions to make a change of the system.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. Are you going to report this session?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I am not certain whether we will or not. We want the power that is given by this order.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. How many experts have you examined?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Five or six.

Mr. GAINES of Tennessee. On which side of the question?

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. Well, three upon one side and four upon the other.

Mr. SIMS. The committee has no side.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. No.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. I would like to ask if the gentleman's committee has been investigating why it is that we have so many gas lamps in the city of Washington, while we also have electric lights, and why it is that we find so many of the old-fashioned gas lamps in the streets?

Mr. SIMS. The Committee on Appropriations can answer that question.

Mr. SMITH of Michigan. I did not hear the gentleman's question.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The question was taken, and the order was agreed to.

ALLOWANCE TO DEPUTY UNITED STATES MARSHALS.

Mr. BANNON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union from the further consideration of the bill H. R. 16274 and to consider the same in the House.

The Clerk read as follows:

A bill (H. R. 16274) to amend section 10 of chapter 252, volume 29, of Public Statutes at Large.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 10 of chapter 252, volume 29, Public Statutes at Large, is hereby amended by striking out in the twelfth line of said section the word "two" and inserting in place thereof the words "three and one-half," so that said section as amended shall read as follows:

"SEC. 10. That when in the opinion of the Attorney-General the public interest requires it, he may, on the recommendation of the marshal, which recommendation shall state the facts as distinguished from conclusions, showing necessity for the same, allow the marshals to employ necessary office deputies and clerical assistance, upon salaries to be fixed by the Attorney-General, from time to time, and paid as hereinafter provided. When any of such office deputies is engaged in the service of any writ, process, subpoena, or other order of the court, or when necessarily absent from the place of his regular employment, on official business, he shall be allowed his actual traveling expenses only, and his necessary and actual expenses for lodging and subsistence, not to exceed three and one-half dollars per day, and the necessary actual expenses in transporting prisoners, including necessary guard hire; and he shall make and render accounts thereof as hereinafter provided."

The amendments recommended by the committee were read, as follows:

Strike out the words "and one-half" where the same appear in line 7 of page 1 and in line 8 of page 2 of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. Reserving the right to object, I would like to have an explanation of the bill given by the gentleman. I should like to know if it has been reported on by the Committee on the Judiciary.

The SPEAKER. The bill seems to be reported from the Committee on the Judiciary.

Mr. BANNON. The bill is reported from the Committee on the Judiciary by a unanimous report and is recommended by the Attorney-General. The object of the bill is simply to increase the maximum allowance to office deputies of United States marshals for necessary and actual expenses for lodging and subsistence when necessarily absent on official business outside of the place of their employment, making it \$3 per day.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Three dollars and fifty cents.

Mr. BANNON. No, sir; the amendment strikes out "and a half," and the increase is from two to three dollars per day.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. MACON. I should like to ask the gentleman this question: The bill does not contemplate any great raid on the Treasury, does it?

Mr. BANNON. Oh, no.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. Is there anything in the bill to limit the number of deputies?

Mr. BANNON. The existing law provides for that, and provides that deputies shall not be appointed, except by and with the consent of the Attorney-General.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. In every case?

Mr. BANNON. In every case under the act of 1896.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. What is meant by the provision "when he is compelled to go outside of his territory?"

Mr. BANNON. Why, outside of the locus of his employment. If a man, for instance, is employed in the city of Cincinnati,

and must go to Columbus or to Dayton or to Springfield, then he will receive his expenses, not exceeding \$3 a day.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. The provision ought to be, when he is required to go outside of the district in which he is a deputy. Is it intended to confine it to the city in which he lives?

Mr. BANNON. No; I mean outside of the place of his employment. Take, for instance, a given district, the federal office building will be in a certain city, as in the city of Chicago or the city of Cincinnati. That is the place of his employment. Occasionally the deputy marshal is given a writ and is obliged to go to some other city to serve that writ, and this simply allows him, when he is away from his headquarters, going to another city, not to exceed \$3 per day for expenses; and I want to say for the benefit of the House and the gentleman that before he can get any expenses whatever allowed he must file an itemized account with the Attorney-General, showing every item expended, and an affidavit that it was paid for in good and lawful money of the United States.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. We are in this condition in the southern district, that the marshal for the southern district is also marshal for the eastern division and the southern division of the southern district. In that district are located three cities, Savannah, Augusta, and Macon. Now, the marshal resides at Macon. If he appoints a deputy in Macon and sends him to Augusta, then is he entitled to this extra compensation when he goes from the city of his residence to the city where he attends court?

Mr. BANNON. It is not for compensation at all. It is for expenses.

Mr. BARTLETT of Georgia. It adds that much to his total compensation, though.

Mr. BANNON. It is not for compensation, but merely for expenses and adds nothing to his compensation. This is unanimously reported by the Committee on the Judiciary and recommended by the Attorney-General.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. As I understand the gentleman, there is no contemplation of an increase of salary at all.

Mr. BANNON. None whatever.

Mr. EDWARDS of Georgia. It is merely for expense money.

Mr. BANNON. Merely for expense money.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill as amended was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, and was accordingly read the third time and passed.

On motion of Mr. BANNON, a motion to reconsider the last vote was laid on the table.

LAKE ERIE AND OHIO RIVER SHIP CANAL.

Mr. DALZELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Railways and Canals from the further consideration of Senate bill 8154, to amend the charter of the Lake Erie and Ohio River Ship Canal Company, approved June 30, 1906.

I make this request in order to get the return of the bill to the Speaker's table. A similar bill has been reported by that committee to the House, and the Senate bill has been referred to that committee but not reported.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks unanimous consent to discharge the Committee on Railways and Canals from the further consideration of the Senate bill referred to, of which the Clerk will report the title, and that the same be returned to the Speaker's table.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. FITZGERALD. What is the purpose of getting this onto the Speaker's table—a change of reference?

Mr. DALZELL. No; I want to get a chance to pass it in the House. The Senate bill went to the Committee on Railways and Canals of the House on the same day that the Committee on Railways and Canals reported an identical bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. What does this bill do?

Mr. DALZELL. It extends the time for the completion of this canal. The gentleman will have an opportunity to pass on the merits of it when I ask to pass the bill.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Is this the only way the gentleman can get the bill from the Railway and Canals Committee?

Mr. DALZELL. It is not the only way. The committee could report it, probably, in time.

Mr. FITZGERALD. The gentleman is on the Committee on Rules, is he not? He could have a rule by which he could bring this matter before the House.

Mr. DALZELL. Oh, yes.

Mr. FITZGERALD. If this request be granted, it will be on the Speaker's table, a similar House bill having been reported.

Mr. DALZELL. Yes; I can ask unanimous consent for consideration, and that is what I propose to do.

Mr. FITZGERALD. Does it require unanimous consent?

Mr. DALZELL. No; I do not think it does.

Mr. FITZGERALD. I think the gentleman ought to let us know what the provisions of the bill are, because if he puts the bill on its passage, it will pass regardless of whether we wish to consent or not.

Mr. DALZELL. I can state what the purpose of the bill is. The charter granted by the last Congress, or perhaps the Congress before, to this company provided that the canal should be commenced within a certain period of time and completed within a certain period. The incorporators have been at work, expended a large amount of money for procuring rights of way and storage reservoirs, and have been prevented from financing the scheme as they expected to do, by reason of the panic. They ask now an extension of time for the commencement of the canal and for its completion.

Mr. MACON. How much time?

Mr. DALZELL. I have forgotten just the period. What does the bill say?

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will read the bill.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 19 of the act granting the Lake Erie and Ohio River Ship Canal Company rights to construct, equip, maintain, and operate a canal or canals and appurtenant works between the Ohio River, in the State of Pennsylvania, and Lake Erie, in the State of Ohio, approved June 30, 1906, be, and it is hereby, amended as follows: In said section of said act strike out the words "three years" and insert the words "six years" in lieu thereof; also strike out the words "ten years" and insert the words "thirteen years" in lieu thereof.

Mr. DALZELL. It gives three additional years.

Mr. GARRETT. Does the gentleman ask for consideration of the bill now?

Mr. DALZELL. No; I do not ask for consideration now.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none and it is so ordered.

ENROLLED BILL SIGNED.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 8460. An act to provide for the deduction of hatchways and water-ballast space from the gross tonnage of vessels.

ENROLLED BILLS PRESENTED TO THE PRESIDENT FOR HIS APPROVAL.

Mr. WILSON of Illinois, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had this day presented to the President of the United States for his approval the following bills:

H. R. 24303. An act for the relief of the estate of Charles Fitzgerald;

H. R. 24635. An act to create a new division in the middle judicial district of the State of Tennessee; and

H. R. 27427. An act to prohibit the importation and use of opium for other than medicinal purposes.

SENATE BILL AND RESOLUTIONS REFERRED.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, Senate bill and resolutions of the following titles were taken from the Speaker's table and referred to their appropriate committees, as indicated below:

S. 8906. An act to provide for the retirement of certain officers on the active list of the Regular Army who have been passed over in promotion by officers junior to them in length of commissioned service—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Senate concurrent resolution 82.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a survey to be made to ascertain the most feasible and practicable route to build a canal or inland waterway on the shores of the Gulf of Mexico, connecting St. Andrews Bay, in the State of Florida, and the Mississippi River, near New Orleans, in the State of Louisiana, with a view to determining the advantage, best location, and probable cost of such canal or inland waterway, and to submit a plan and an estimate for such improvements—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution 83.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to cause a preliminary examination and survey to be made of Potham Beach, Maine, with a view to the building of a bulkhead or breakwater along said beach for the protection of property of the United States, and to prevent the deposit of sand in navigable waters adjacent thereto—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Senate concurrent resolution 86.

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring), That the Secretary of War be, and he is hereby, directed to cause a survey to be made of the harbor at Blaine, Wash., to determine cost and advisability of its improvements—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. SCOTT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 20 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

A letter from the chairman of the Interstate Commerce Commission, transmitting a reply to the inquiry of the House as to advances in freight charges (H. Doc. No. 1412)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Secretary of State submitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of the claim of the Roman Catholic Church in Porto Rico (H. Doc. No. 1413)—to the Committee on Insular Affairs and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for claims allowed by accounting officers under exhausted appropriations, etc. (H. Doc. No. 1414)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting an estimate of appropriation for pneumatic-tube service in the customs service in New York City (H. Doc. No. 1415)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Auditor for the War Department submitting an estimate of appropriation for payment of the claims of the State of Kansas (H. Doc. No. 1416)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a copy of a letter from the Attorney-General submitting an estimate of appropriation for payments of judgments in Indian depredation cases (H. Doc. No. 1417)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

A letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting papers and recommendations relating to appropriations to satisfy the judgment in the case of the Eastern Cherokees against The United States (H. Doc. No. 1418)—to the Committee on Appropriations and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MARTIN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23473) extending the time for final entry of mineral claims within the Shoshone or Wind River Reservation in Wyoming, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2041), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 21138) to increase the efficiency of the Pay Department, U. S. Army, reported the same with amendments, accompanied by a report (No. 2043), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. ALEXANDER of New York, from the Committee on the Judiciary, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 26068) providing for an additional judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2044), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HACKNEY, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 27244) to enable the Winnebago Indians to protect from overflow their tribal and allotted lands located within the boundaries of any drainage district in Nebraska, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2045), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. CAPRON, from the Committee on Foreign Affairs, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 27818) providing for participation in the Universal and International Exhi-

bition to be held at Brussels in 1910, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2047), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. GREENE, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 27479) to require motor vessels to be equipped with mufflers, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2046), which said bill and report were referred to the House Calendar.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. HASKINS, from the Committee on War Claims, to which was referred the amendments of the Senate to the bill of the House (H. R. 15372) for the allowance of certain claims reported by the Court of Claims under the provisions of the acts approved March 3, 1883, and March 3, 1887, and commonly known as the "Bowman" and the "Tucker" acts, and for other purposes, reported the same, accompanied by a report (No. 2038), which said amendments, bill, and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 4168) to carry out the findings of the Court of Claims in the case of James A. Paulk, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2039), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HOWLAND, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill of the House (H. R. 23699) to grant to John T. Rivett privilege to make commutation of his homestead entry, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2040), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

Mr. HULL of Iowa, from the Committee on Military Affairs, to which was referred the joint resolution of the Senate (S. R. 119) authorizing the Secretary of War to award gold medals to Orville Wright and Wilbur Wright, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 2042), which said joint resolution and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXII, committees were discharged from the consideration of the following bills, which were referred as follows:

A bill (H. R. 27464) granting a pension to Emmett Puckett—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 27569) granting an increase of pension to Stanley R. Bronson—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 17779) granting an increase of pension to S. G. Ragsdale—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

A bill (H. R. 27633) granting a pension to Henry M. Allen—Committee on Invalid Pensions discharged, and referred to the Committee on Pensions.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. STEVENS of Minnesota: A bill (H. R. 27666) regulating details of officers of the army—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 27667) to amend an act authorizing the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to grant to the Veteran Volunteer Firemen's Association use of certain property in the city of Washington, approved March 2, 1891—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. KAHN: A bill (H. R. 27668) to amend sections 612, 613, 617, and 621 of the Code of Law for the District of Columbia—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. COOK of Colorado: A bill (H. R. 27669) to amend paragraph 7, chapter 389, of volume 1 (second edition) of the Supplement to the Revised Statutes of the United States, relating to park watchmen—to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 27670) for the prevention and punishment of cruelty to animals—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. DALZELL: A bill (H. R. 27671) providing for an additional judge for the western district of Pennsylvania, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BURKE: A bill (H. R. 27672) to require radio-telegraphic installations and radio-telegraphers on certain ocean steamers—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. OLCOTT: A bill (H. R. 27673) to incorporate the trustees of the Chi Psi Fraternity—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LINDSAY: Joint resolution (H. J. Res. 251) to authorize the Secretary of War to furnish 50 condemned rifles to the Union Guard, a military organization attached to the Church of the Most Holy Trinity, of Brooklyn, N. Y.—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. RODENBERG: Concurrent resolution (H. C. Res. 63) authorizing the Interstate Commerce Commission to make investigations concerning railroad appliances, etc.—to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions of the following titles were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ACHESON: A bill (H. R. 27674) granting an increase of pension to George W. Lloyd—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ANDRUS: A bill (H. R. 27675) granting an increase of pension to John Meadows—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. BARCHFELD: A bill (H. R. 27676) authorizing and directing the Secretary of State to examine and settle the claim of the Wales Island Packing Company—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. BARNHART: A bill (H. R. 27677) granting an increase of pension to John R. Kissinger—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. BURLESON: A bill (H. R. 27678) granting an increase of pension to Henry C. Hubert—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27679) granting an increase of pension to Henry T. Hill—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27680) granting an increase of pension to Isaac C. Holt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27681) granting an increase of pension to John Hutchinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27682) granting an increase of pension to John W. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27683) granting an increase of pension to Joseph H. Harris—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27684) granting an increase of pension to Joshua F. Huff—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27685) granting an increase of pension to Montraville Harrell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27686) granting an increase of pension to Robert T. Hurley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27687) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Hall—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27688) granting an increase of pension to William Hurst—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27689) granting an increase of pension to Christopher C. Johnson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27690) granting an increase of pension to Edwin P. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27691) granting an increase of pension to Frank Jenull—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27692) granting an increase of pension to John J. Jacobs—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27693) granting an increase of pension to William B. King—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27694) granting an increase of pension to Robert H. King—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27695) granting an increase of pension to Richard J. D. Kolb—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27696) granting an increase of pension to James W. Kennedy—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27697) granting an increase of pension to Stephen A. Jones—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27698) granting an increase of pension to Thomas C. Capell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27699) granting an increase of pension to William A. Cole—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27700) granting an increase of pension to John H. Bingham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27701) granting an increase of pension to Alexander B. Davis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27702) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Dye—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27703) granting an increase of pension to Charles Wesley Danley—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27704) granting an increase of pension to John H. Debord—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27705) granting an increase of pension to Alexander Earp—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27706) granting an increase of pension to Henry W. Ellis—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27707) granting an increase of pension to Robert W. Eller—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27708) granting an increase of pension to Adam H. Files—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27709) granting an increase of pension to John M. Fleming—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27710) granting an increase of pension to Solomon Fitzhugh—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27711) granting an increase of pension to William B. Fleming—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27712) granting an increase of pension to Elijah Goodnight—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27713) granting an increase of pension to Emory Gibbons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27714) granting an increase of pension to Frederick Mortimer Gibony—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27715) granting an increase of pension to John R. Gibbons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27716) granting an increase of pension to Wenceslao Garza—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27717) granting an increase of pension to William R. Gregg—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27718) granting an increase of pension to Alfred House—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27719) granting an increase of pension to John Campbell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27720) granting an increase of pension to John F. Arnett—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27721) granting an increase of pension to Abner H. Beard—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27722) granting an increase of pension to Alfred G. Brown—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27723) granting an increase of pension to Anton L. Berger—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27724) granting an increase of pension to Charles Bock—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27725) granting an increase of pension to James Besser—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27726) granting an increase of pension to William L. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27727) granting an increase of pension to James S. Bigham—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27728) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Boles—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27729) granting an increase of pension to Milton C. Baird—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27730) granting an increase of pension to William H. Baxter—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27731) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin F. Cotton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27732) granting an increase of pension to Elijah S. Close—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27733) granting an increase of pension to Isaac S. Chapman—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27734) granting an increase of pension to Jerry C. Campbell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27735) granting an increase of pension to John Campbell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27736) granting an increase of pension to Nicholas N. Cox—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27737) granting an increase of pension to Robert Carson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27738) granting an increase of pension to John Y. Rankin—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27739) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Rainbolt—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27740) granting an increase of pension to Marion M. Redmon—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27741) granting an increase of pension to William B. Reagan—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27742) granting an increase of pension to Benjamin N. Shropshire—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27743) granting an increase of pension to Gustav H. Schmeltzer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27744) granting an increase of pension to Israel S. Standefer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27745) granting an increase of pension to Josephus Sparrow—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27746) granting an increase of pension to Robert Schaefer—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27747) granting an increase of pension to Samuel Shelton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27748) granting an increase of pension to Valerius P. Sanders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27749) granting an increase of pension to George W. Tom—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27750) granting an increase of pension to H. Simpson Tom—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27751) granting an increase of pension to William O. Tumlinson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27752) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27753) granting an increase of pension to David A. T. Walton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27754) granting an increase of pension to Emil F. Wurzbach—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27755) granting an increase of pension to Isaac Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27756) granting an increase of pension to James F. Wright—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27757) granting an increase of pension to Philip A. Work—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27758) granting an increase of pension to James P. H. Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27759) granting an increase of pension to Sebastian Wipff, sr.—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27760) granting an increase of pension to William A. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27761) granting an increase of pension to William A. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27762) granting an increase of pension to Wilson H. White—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27763) granting an increase of pension to George H. Adams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27764) granting an increase of pension to Jacob Anders—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27765) granting an increase of pension to Joel W. Adkins—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27766) granting an increase of pension to Valentine Wilson—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27767) granting an increase of pension to Hezekiah G. Williams—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27768) granting an increase of pension to Hermann W. Toepperwein—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27769) granting an increase of pension to George W. Light—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27770) granting an increase of pension to James M. Low—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27771) granting an increase of pension to Levi D. Ladd—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27772) granting an increase of pension to Martin V. Lackey—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27773) granting an increase of pension to Robert G. Long—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27774) granting an increase of pension to David McEadden—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27775) granting an increase of pension to George W. McKinzie—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27776) granting an increase of pension to Samuel J. McElrath—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27777) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Mahavier—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27778) granting an increase of pension to Leonard Moss—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27779) granting an increase of pension to Lewellen Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27780) granting an increase of pension to Marcellus Moore—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27781) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Nimitz—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27782) granting an increase of pension to Frederick W. Nehaus—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27783) granting an increase of pension to Charles A. Patton—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27784) granting an increase of pension to George S. Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27785) granting an increase of pension to Green B. Powell—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27786) granting an increase of pension to Robert Parsons—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27787) granting an increase of pension to William W. Parker—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. CHAPMAN: A bill (H. R. 27788) granting a pension to George Frazier—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27789) granting an increase of pension to William J. Gwaltney—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27790) granting an increase of pension to Calvin Burton, alias Calvin Birg—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CUSHMAN: A bill (H. R. 27791) granting an increase of pension to Robert Lyman—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27792) granting an increase of pension to William R. Fontaine—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DE ARMOND: A bill (H. R. 27793) granting an increase of pension to William Davis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLAS: A bill (H. R. 27794) granting an increase of pension to Robert Knox—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FASSETT: A bill (H. R. 27795) granting an increase of pension to Thomas Putnam—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FLOOD: A bill (H. R. 27796) granting a pension to Myers Fertig—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: A bill (H. R. 27797) granting an increase of pension to Julia McPhail—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GILLESPIE: A bill (H. R. 27798) for the relief of the heirs of John Ferrel, deceased—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HARDING: A bill (H. R. 27799) granting an increase of pension to Donald McDonald—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HELM: A bill (H. R. 27800) granting a pension to H. Rowan Saufley—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KIMBALL: A bill (H. R. 27801) granting a pension to Eliza Jane Ellis—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LAFEAN: A bill (H. R. 27802) granting a pension to Evalina Inswiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. PATTERSON: A bill (H. R. 27803) for the relief of Alden R. Holden—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. RAUCH: A bill (H. R. 27804) granting a pension to Martha Dunkle—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27805) granting an increase of pension to Robert M. Miller—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 27806) granting an increase of pension to Frank G. Cook—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27807) granting an increase of pension to Joseph A. Paul—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SULZER: A bill (H. R. 27808) for the relief of Charles Wright Geddes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TIRRELL: A bill (H. R. 27809) to reimburse Charles K. Darling for moneys necessarily expended by him as clerk of the court of appeals for the first circuit—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MURDOCK: A bill (H. R. 27810) for the relief of E. N. Smith—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27811) for the relief of the Watson Mill Company—to the Committee on Claims.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27812) granting an increase of pension to Charles W. Charter—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SABATH: A bill (H. R. 27813) granting a pension to Mary Petrik—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27814) granting a pension to Anton Slama—to the Committee on Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 27815) granting a pension to Marie Kuchar—to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. SHERLEY: A bill (H. R. 27816) granting a pension to Teresa C. Cooper—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 27817) granting an increase of pension to Samuel F. Johnson—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. ALLEN: Petition of the Elias Thomas Company and the Thompson Hall Company, of Portland, Me., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. ANSBERRY: Petition of Board of Trade of Columbus, Ohio, favoring such legislation touching transportation as is best calculated to restore business confidence—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of farmers' institute held at Haviland, Paulding County, Ohio, January 23, 1909, in favor of parcels post and postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. ASHBROOK: Petition of the Ohio Seventh-Day Adventists conference, against S. 3940 (Johnston Sunday law)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. BATES: Petition of W. H. Duffey & Co., of Corry, Pa., for removal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of C. A. Curtze, of Erie, Pa., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of Erie, Pa., favoring creation of a permanent tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BIRDSALL: Petition of Robert Large and other citizens of Iowa, against duty on teas and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. BUIKE: Petition of Pittsburg Association of Credit Men, favoring the Sherley bill (H. R. 21929), amending the national bankruptcy act—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of the H. J. Heinz Company, of Pittsburg, favoring bills proposing certain amendments to the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the American Bridge Company, favoring Senate Document No. 686, for purchase and erection of a government testing machine—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of John F. Becker and others, favoring the omnibus claims bill (H. R. 15372) for payment of overtime claims of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. CALDER: Petition of J. W. Miller, captain of New York Naval Militia, favoring H. R. 7620, establishing a naval militia—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of National Rivers and Harbors Congress, favoring issuance of bonds to improve such waterways of the country as have been favorably reported upon by the United States Corps of Engineers through the Secretary of War—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of office of superintendent of public works of Albany, for legislation to aid in the improvement of the upper Hudson River—to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

Also, petition of New York Produce Exchange, against federal inspection and grading of grain (S. 382)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of the Maritime Association of the Port of New York, favoring H. R. 15657, relative to licensed officers of steam and sail vessels—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CAPRON: Petition of the Dry Dock and Marine Railway Company, Providence, R. I., favoring H. R. 25542, regarding maritime liens—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. CARY: Petition of Chamber of Commerce of Milwaukee, favoring "An act to regulate commerce" (H. R. 22901, 22902, and 22903)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of C. F. Schimmel & Co., for removal of specific duty on linoleum and oilcloth (8 cents per yard on same and 20 cents per square yard on other kinds)—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. COCKS of New York: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Edward Trenchard—to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COOK of Pennsylvania: Petition of Philadelphia Law Association, favoring increase of salaries of United States judges (S. 6973)—to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. DRAPER: Petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, for establishment of a merchant marine to insure a line of fast ships for Australia, Asia, and the Orient—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. ELLIS of Missouri: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles E. Collins—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FAIRCHILD: Petition of J. O. & G. N. Rowe, of Oneonta, N. Y., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of John S. Collins, of Moorestown, N. J., against parcels-post and postal savings bank laws—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of the Keep, Nathan & Fisher Company, of Chicago, and Bradner Smith & Co., favoring improvement of bankruptcy act in the Sherley bill (H. R. 21929)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, for enactment of an ocean mail steamship bill to secure a line of fast ships to Australia, Asia, and the Orient—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

Also, petition of the Illinois State Horticultural Society, favoring S. 6515 and H. R. 21358, concerning national supervision over insecticides and fungicides—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Julia McPhail—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GOULDEN: Petition of Society of Columbia University Architects, against placing the Lincoln memorial near the Union Station—to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. GRAHAM: Petition of John F. Becker and others, favoring H. R. 15375, for payment of overtime claim of letter carriers—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Pittsburg Association of Credit Men, favoring amendment to the bankruptcy act as per the Sherley bill (H. R. 21929)—to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of American Bridge Company, of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring appropriation for construction of a testing machine (S. Doc. No. 686)—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of the H. J. Heinz Company, of Pittsburg, Pa., favoring certain bills proposing amendments to the interstate-commerce act—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRONNA: Petitions of citizens of Norwood, McVie, and Clyde, all in the State of North Dakota, against a tariff on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HAMILTON of Iowa: Petition of 850 citizens and church members of Keota, Iowa, favoring legislation against importation of opium—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of citizens of Oskaloosa, Iowa, against the establishment of a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. HAMMOND: Petition of C. W. Denhart and 29 others, of Pipestone, Minn., against duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HASKINS: Petition of Danville Grange, No. 325, of Danville, Vt., favoring the establishment of parcels post and postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of White River Grange, No. 53, of South Royalton, Vt., in favor of H. R. 15837, for a national highways commission and appropriation giving federal aid to construction and maintenance of public highways—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. HOUSTON: Paper to accompany bill for relief of James Smithson (H. R. 24710)—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of heirs of Robert Fullerton (H. R. 23918)—to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HOWELL of New Jersey: Petition of Manufacturing Jewelers' Association, of Newark, N. J., favoring a permanent tariff commission—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Rev. J. G. Mason, against sale of intoxicants in all ships and buildings used by the United States (Tirrell bill, H. R. 12405), and in favor of various other bills upon the subject of temperance—to the Committee on Alcoholic Liquor Traffic.

By Mr. HUFF: Petition of Kansas State Retail Merchants' Association, favoring S. 28, relative to ocean mail—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. KIMBALL: Petition of Turners Station (Ky.) Bank, against parcels post on the rural mail-delivery routes and postal savings banks—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of E. L. Martin and others, of Lexington, Ky., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LAFEAN: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Abraham Hetrick (H. R. 21970)—to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, paper to accompany bill for relief of Evalina Imswiler—to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LINDBERGH: Petition of citizens of Litchfield, Minn., against a duty on tea and coffee—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. LOUD: Petition of business men of Oscada, Mich., against establishment of parcels post and postal savings banks (S. 5122 and 6484)—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, favoring establishment of a merchant marine of fast ships for Australia, Asia, and the Orient—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. PEARRE: Petition of citizens of Frostburg, Hancock, Mount Savage, Echert Mines, and Cumberland, all in the State of Maryland, against establishment of a parcels-post and postal savings bank system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of E. H. Welsh and Hetzel Brothers & Co., of Cumberland, Md., favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. RAINEY: Petition of Hansfurther Stone Company and 6 other business firms of White Hall, Ill., favoring repeal of duty on hides—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. SULZER: Paper to accompany bill for relief of Charles Wright Geddes—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Religious Liberty Bureau, against passage of Johnston bill (S. 3940)—to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, petition of Headquarters Grand Army of the Republic and F. H. Magdeburg, of Milwaukee, against consolidation of pension agencies at Washington—to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, petition of National Lumber Manufacturers' Association, against reduction of tariff on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of board of directors of New Orleans Cotton Exchange, favoring investigation by the Secretary of Agriculture into the use and substitution of raw cotton for other materials of manufacture and report thereon—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Shore Line Railway Association, for legislation to secure fair compensation for railway service of carrying the mails—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of New York Produce Exchange, against federal inspection and grading of grain (S. 382)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Also, petition of J. W. Miller, captain of New York Naval Militia, favoring H. R. 7620, establishing a naval militia—to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

Also, petition of Calaveras bigtree committee of the Outdoor Art League of the Department of California Club, for appropriation to preserve the big trees of the Calaveras groves—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, memorial of Spring Valley Water Company, against House joint resolution 223, allowing city and county of San Francisco to exchange lands for reservoir sites in Lake Eleanor and Hetch Hetchy valleys, in the Yosemite National Park, and for other purposes—to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Ohio: Petition of Isaac Eberly Company and G. W. Bobb Company, of Columbus, Ohio, favoring repeal of duty on raw and refined sugars—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. TIRRELL: Petition of W. J. Nutting and others, for the creation of a national highways commission (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. TOU VELLE: Petition of Gibson Grange, No. 692, for national highways commission and federal aid in construction of public roads (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. TOWNSEND: Petition of Tecumseh Grange, of Tecumseh, Mich., favoring Senate bills 5122 and 6484, for the parcels-post and postal savings bank system—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

Also, petition of Michigan Chapter of the American Institute of Architects, against placing the Lincoln memorial near the Union Station—to the Committee on the Library.

Also, petition of Cadmus Grange, for the creation of a national highways commission and for an appropriation to give federal aid to the States in highway construction (H. R. 15837)—to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. VREELAND: Petition of Belfast Grange, No. 1068, of Belfast, N. Y., favoring establishment of postal savings banks and a parcels post—to the Committee on the Post-Office and Post-Roads.

By Mr. WANGER: Petition of Illinois Manufacturers' Association, favoring enactment of the ocean mail steamship bill—to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. WOOD: Petition of River Side Grange, No. 125, Patrons of Husbandry, of Three Bridges, N. J., for removal of duty on lumber—to the Committee on Ways and Means.

Also, petition of Pennington (N. J.) Grange, No. 64, Patrons of Husbandry, favoring federal aid to highways by establishment of a national highways commission—to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of New Jersey state board of agriculture and New Jersey State Horticultural Society, favoring H. R. 21318, for preventing manufacture, sale, or transportation of adulterated or misbranded fungicides or insecticides—to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SENATE.

FRIDAY, February 5, 1909.

Prayer by the Chaplain, Rev. Edward E. Hale.

The Secretary proceeded to read the Journal of yesterday's proceedings, when, on request of Mr. KEAN, and by unanimous consent, the further reading was dispensed with.

The VICE-PRESIDENT. The Journal stands approved.

USES OF DENATURED ALCOHOL.

The VICE-PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a communication from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting a special and detailed report of the Commissioner of Internal Revenue and the chief chemist of the bureau to the Secretary of the Treasury, reviewing observations and work in Europe regarding denatured alcohol, its manufacture and uses (H. Doc. No. 1419), which, with the accompanying paper, was referred to the Committee on Finance and ordered to be printed.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE.

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. W. J. Browning, its Chief Clerk, announced that the House insists upon its amendment to the bill (S. 6350) to change the name and jurisdiction of the inferior court of justice of the peace in the District of Columbia, disagreed to by the Senate; agrees to the conference asked for by the Senate on the disagreeing vote of the two Houses thereon, and had appointed Mr. CAMPBELL, Mr. OLCOTT, and Mr. JOHNSON of Kentucky managers at the conference on the part of the House.

The message also announced that the House had passed the following bills, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate:

H. R. 16274. An act to amend section 10 of chapter 252, volume 29, of Public Statutes at Large; and

H. R. 26482. An act to authorize the construction of two bridges across Rock River, State of Illinois.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

The message further announced that the Speaker of the House had signed the following enrolled bills, and they were thereupon signed by the Vice-President:

S. 8460. An act to provide for the deduction of hatchways and water-ballast space from the gross tonnage of vessels;

H. R. 2952. An act for the relief of Chaplain Henry Swift, Thirtieth Infantry, U. S. Army;

H. R. 10752. An act to complete the military record of Adolphus Erwin Wells;

H. R. 11460. An act to remove the charge of desertion from the military record of William H. Houck;

H. R. 16015. An act for the relief of Lafayette L. McKnight; and

H. R. 20171. An act to correct the military record of George H. Tracy.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS.

The VICE-PRESIDENT presented petitions of Liberty Grange, No. 1557, of Trumbull County, Ohio; of Local Grange No. 140, of Freedom, N. H.; and of local grange of Wauseon, Ohio, all Patrons of Husbandry, praying for the passage of the so-called "rural parcels-post" and "postal savings banks" bills, which were referred to the Committee on Post-Offices and Post-Roads.

Mr. DICK presented a memorial of the Produce Exchange of Toledo, Ohio, remonstrating against the enactment of legislation providing for the inspection and grading of grain under federal control, which was ordered to lie on the table.

He also presented petitions of Pomona Grange, of Franklin County; of Friendship Grange, No. 670, of Hardin County; and of Local Grange No. 271, of Sharon, all Patrons of Husbandry, in the State of Ohio, praying for the passage of the